

Smash Rhodesia's Racist Rule!

FEBRUARY 19—White minority rule in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) is moving inexorably toward a bloody end. Guerrilla operations have intensified in recent months, and the definitive collapse of the Geneva negotiations last month has more or less eliminated any remaining slight possibility of an imperialist-negotiated solution. Moreover, the insurgent nationalists' ranks are now swelling as hundreds of youths flee into neighboring black-ruled Botswana, Zambia and Mozambique.

The increasingly desperate Salisbury regime continues to herd thousands of rural tribesmen into so-called "protec-

tive villages" while gunning down luckless Africans caught during the dusk-to-dawn "war zone" curfew. However, closure of all trade outlets except South Africa, dwindling tourism and the dislocation caused by military call-ups from the small white workforce have hamstrung the economy, while the army appears to be stretched to the limit.

Playing for time and international support, Ian Smith's government has launched an international propaganda blitz—capitalizing on the brutal execution of seven white missionaries early last week, ballyhooing a few token racial



Der Spiegel
Rhodesian soldier stands guard against guerrilla attack at border camp.

reforms, thrusting tribal politicians forward as genuine black representatives and charging that the guerrillas only terrorize rural blacks into submission. But while the nationalists' appeal is weakened by their sordid history of personal cliquist rivalry and tribal conflicts all signs point to increasing support for the guerrillas.

With the government headed by racist archetypes of the arrogant white settler, no eleventh-hour "liberal" facelift can possibly give the regime any effective credibility among the blacks (even with its figurehead black senators and cabinet members). Hence the reliance on

military intimidation and the quarantining of 200,000 tribesmen in the "protective villages" so reminiscent of the Vietnam war. But the entire white population amounts to barely 5 percent of the total—a militarily unviable fraction against any serious guerrilla war so long as the Rhodesian regime remains internationally isolated.

Guerrillas on the Offensive

Although the guerrilla forces are still relatively small (estimates run between 8,000 and 20,000) and mainly confined to hit-and-run operations, they are

continued on page 10

Pitched Battle over Nuclear Power Plant in Germany

FEBRUARY 21—Since last October, West Germany has been in an uproar over the question of nuclear energy. Repeated demonstrations at the site of an atomic power plant under construction in the village of Brokdorf, near the mouth of the Elbe River about 50 kilometers northwest of Hamburg, have been met with massive and often brutal police repression. Both federal and state governments have justified the police tactics, denouncing the protestors as "chaos-mongers and terrorists."

The latest incident in this running battle came on Saturday, when anti-nuclear demonstrators were prevented from marching on Brokdorf by an unprecedented mobilization of more than 6,000 police and the paramilitary federal border guard who hermetically sealed the region. Inside the perimeter the police had massed water cannons, armored cars and helicopters, while roadblocks were manned by units of one hundred armed with submachine guns.


The government's "terrorist" baiting succeeded in dividing the anti-nuclear demonstrators into two groups. The Citizens Initiative for Environmental Protection (BU), led by bourgeois liberals, and the pro-Moscow Communist Party (DKP) drew 15,000 to a

pacifist demonstration at the county seat of Itzehoe, about 20 kilometers from Brokdorf. Several Maoist groups assembled an equal number near the Wilder marsh to make at least a token attempt to carry out the original plan of occupying the plant site. However, the radicals stopped at the police barricades and finally dispersed in the late afternoon.

Opponents of atomic power also marched in Berlin, Munich and Frankfurt (where they were dispersed by a police baton charge). Some 800 protestors succeeded in occupying a nuclear plant construction site at Grohnde on

**Eco-Freaks vs. the
Atomic Energy Lobby**

**Nuclear
Power and
the Workers
Movement... 6**



Der Spiegel
Riot police protecting Brokdorf site

the Weser River. Altogether 87 persons were reported jailed, and authorities announced that demonstrators arrested near Brokdorf were "armed" with such weapons as steel bars, wire-cutters, grappling hooks and steel kites to thwart helicopters.

During the preceding week the government's scare tactics sought to whip up an anti-terrorist frenzy. Social Democratic Party (SPD) federal chancellor Helmut Schmidt threatened on nationwide television that, "When a fanatical minority attempts to misuse the people's desire for security for the purpose of agitation and deliberately seeks confrontation, it must be opposed with determination."

Ironically, the grounds given for banning the march on Brokdorf were, "expected acts of violence, virtually certain to damage the health of participants in the demonstration..." Yet to enforce the ban, thousands of heavily armed police ringed the village. Hospi-

tals in Hamburg were alerted to receive hundreds of wounded demonstrators by police helicopter. It is obvious who are the real terrorists.

The Battle of Brokdorf

The massive police mobilization on February 19 effectively canceled the protestors' right to demonstrate. However, it was only a pale reflection of the savage police brutality which met previous demonstrations at Brokdorf last autumn. When 5,000 demonstrators protesting the beginning of construction at the nuclear plant site on October 30 committed the unpardonable sin of disregarding signs proclaiming, "Private property—Access forbidden," they were dispersed by mounted police using tear gas.

At a subsequent demonstration by some 30,000 protestors on November 13, the police reaction was even more sadistic. In their zeal for capitalist "law

continued on page 11

SWP Embraces Landrum-Griffin

Detroit
14 February 1977

To the editor:

In the course of his recent tour for Ed Sadlowski, Socialist Workers Party (SWP) national secretary Jack Barnes made a point of extolling the virtues of the most reactionary anti-working-class legislation as a tool for instituting "democracy" in the labor movement. Sounding for all the world like Bobby Kennedy fulminating against union corruption during the notorious McClellan hearings, Barnes in particular urged utilization of the Landrum-Griffin Act to "safeguard union democracy."

WV No. 144 notes that in Chicago Barnes said, "Sادلowski and the workers are fools if they don't use the Landrum-Griffin Act, using every clause." At his Detroit forum, I heard him once again implore Steelworkers Fight Back to use Landrum-Griffin in order to overturn the apparent McBride victory. He also vigorously attacked I. W. Abel (who has his own motives, of course) for demanding the repeal of Title I of Landrum-Griffin.

Barnes' faith in the virtues of this anti-union law stands in stark contrast to the universal recognition by socialists and labor militants in 1959 that passage of this bill was a direct blow at the independence of the labor movement, in the tradition of the anti-communist strikebreaking Taft-Hartley Act. It is ironic that in Farrell Dobbs' *Recent Trends in the Labor Movement* (a collection of his articles from the 1966-67 *Militant*) even this tired hack roundly condemns the same Landrum-Griffin Act which Barnes now considers the road to union democracy.

Of course, Dobbs (Barnes' predecessor as national secretary of the SWP from 1953 to 1972) was one of the main culprits in the degeneration of the SWP from a party which proudly defended the workers' cause into a bunch of reformist bootlickers. But even though the SWP had already qualitatively degenerated, Dobbs' 1966-67 writings at least recognize a class line between the labor movement and the capitalist state, something Barnes forgot to mention in his talk.

Dobbs described the "Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin 'killer law'" as a serious threat to organized labor:

"Provisions were made for government supervision over the election of union officers, stewards, etc. Dissident members were encouraged to sue the union and its officers in the capitalist courts.

"The Secretary of Labor was given sweeping powers to investigate internal union affairs. He was empowered to send his agents into union premises, and inspect membership lists, financial accounts, files and other records. These agents were authorized to question whomever they chose."

Summing up the duplicity and intentions of Landrum-Griffin, Dobbs noted: "When capitalist politicians pretend concern about bureaucratic abuses of democracy within the unions, the SWP said the real aim is to raise false hopes that the rank and file can rely on the government to uphold their rights. It is a trick to get workers to accept government intervention in internal union affairs." Well, that's certainly not what the SWP says today!

Today Barnes completely supports Sadlowski's court suits to review union finances, obtain government regulation of the union press and insure maximum Labor Department supervision of union elections. But ten years ago, Farrell Dobbs expressed a different view: "Under the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin Act the government can put a political cop in any union hall, committee rooms or other working quarters. Such monstrous invasion of union autonomy is palmed off as a 'bill of rights' for rank and file workers."

The SWP's "fight" to "democratize the unions" through the courts and government agencies flies in the face of the principle Dobbs put succinctly: "Defense of workers democracy must also include a fight for unconditional independence of the unions from government control." Most of the left supported Sadlowski (and before him Arnold Miller in the Mine Workers), excusing or, like the SWP, defending his anti-union court suits. Even though a question like this should be ABC for any class-conscious unionist, the Spartacist League's consistent defense of union independence has unfortunately been unique among all the socialist groups in the U.S.

For a class-struggle leadership,
K.D.

Nuclear Power

Boston, Mass.
November 28, 1976

Dear Editor:

I would like to respond to the points made in *WV* No. 131 (29 October 1976) concerning the question of nuclear power plants in Sweden.

It is true that the anti-nuclear power plant movement is petty bourgeois in Sweden as it is in the U.S. It consists of many different types of people with various aims and class backgrounds. This, however, does not negate the necessity for a serious examination of the question itself by Marxists, since such movements often are responses to basic contradictions in the capitalist system itself.

To support a call for a moratorium of construction of dangerous nuclear fission power plants is not equivalent to opposing technical progress or calling for a return to the pre-industrial eras of rustic stagnation. Because of a limited supply of usable uranium-235 (about 40 yrs), nuclear fission is not projected as the energy of the future, but rather as an unnecessary bridge between present coal intensive energy and future sources. These future energy sources include wind energy, tidal energy, satellite transmitted solar energy (which can work irregardless of how long the winter lasts!) and nuclear fusion power which uses deuterium, a material readily

available in ocean water and does not require disposal of dangerous nuclear wastes. The technical means for all but the latter have already been developed.

To merely call for a fight for comprehensive safety precautions for nuclear power plants as one would for a factory is to avoid the long range problem of nuclear waste disposal. Many of the highly radioactive wastes decay rapidly while others require a long time. The isotopes of most concern, strontium-90 and cesium-137, require hundreds of years to decay to a safe level, and plutonium-239, which has a half life of 24,400 years, will be dangerous for 250,000 years. Such wastes, if not properly stored, will seriously contaminate groundwater supplies and the storage problem has not been resolved technically.

In short, science is not yet able to provide comprehensive safety precautions for nuclear power plants. Therefore, Marxists should support not "the junking of atomic power" but rather a moratorium on nuclear power plant siting until the adequate safety technology is available. This position does not imply an orientation toward a "new mass vanguard" of anti-nuclear power activists nor electoral support to the KAF (Swedish section of USec), but rather a recognition of physical reality and the dangers of unplanned economy.

Comradely,
W. Hendrikson

WV replies: See article on nuclear power in this issue.

Harlan County, U.S.A.

February 10, 1977

Dear Editor,

Your review of "Harlan County, U.S.A." (HCUSA) in *WV* No. 144 left what I thought was a skewed impression of trade union consciousness and militancy upon your readers.

First let me say that the political conclusions *WV* draws are correct. *WV* said that as a political statement HCUSA never went beyond militant unionism. And it was stated that militant unionism was not enough but that political conclusions must be drawn about the role of the bureaucracy and the need for political struggle by the working class to seize power. The point I want to make is why trade union militancy is not enough.

Trade union consciousness, no matter how militant, is still bourgeois consciousness. The years of militancy in the coal fields and the deaths of perhaps thousands of miners have been wasted. The same trade union issues fought over in the 1930's are being fought today because bourgeois consciousness has not been replaced by class consciousness. A contract is nothing but a limited peace treaty between labor and capital. Hence from a socialist perspective, contracts can never be a victory, as the centrists and reformists would have it. At best, a contract is a draw. (Strikes however, can obviously be victorious in that they win a contract or some other concession.)

I know there is no accounting for taste but from my point of view, HCUSA is far from a "first rate documentary." Rather it is liberal mish-mash, à la "Billy Jack," depicting simple trade unionism as an end unto itself. If one were to take this movie as good coin, the "class struggle is not dead"—only critically wounded. There is no hope of recovery without the vanguard party leading a class conscious working class to state

power (which *WV* said and HCUSA did not).

Keep up the excellent standards that have made *WV* the best (only) weekly Marxist press in the country.

Comradely,
M.B.

WV replies: M.B.'s letter seems to miss the point of the film, "Harlan County, U.S.A." and the events it documents. The strike against Duke Power Company for union recognition was hard-fought and it won. The film portrays that struggle with honesty, sympathy, power and often beauty.

M.B. calls the film "liberal mish-mash ... depicting simple trade unionism as an end unto itself." But to document trade-union militancy is not identical to putting forward a political theory of militant trade unionism counterposed to the need for a vanguard party. Certainly, the miners did not have revolutionary consciousness (although many were strongly class-conscious). Yet it was a militant strike, not trade-union consciousness, that the film celebrated.

All they won was a contract, says M.B., and contracts "can never be a victory." True, a contract is merely a truce—but there are different kinds of truces. A strike is a class battle, which can result in a defeat, a draw, a victory. The crisis of revolutionary leadership, which has left the power of the labor movement under the sway of pro-capitalist bureaucrats, has meant that precious few militant struggles are fought out to victory. But it is important to recognize a victory when we see one, in fact and on film. In Harlan County there was a limited victory for the workers, and when our side in the class struggle won, we hailed it:

"After thirteen months on strike the miners of Brookside, Kentucky scored a victory when Duke Power Company ... agreed to accept the national contract of the United Mine Workers of America."

—*Women and Revolution*,
Autumn 1974

Presumably, M.B. would have had us attack "HCUSA" as syndicalist instead of writing a generally favorable review which also stressed that the filmmaker did not draw the lessons of the strike. But the film did not seek to make a coherent political statement. The filmmaker, a liberal, merely portrayed the development of the Harlan events as seen through the eyes of the most militant workers. Certainly the strike might have been a very different political event if there had been a powerful presence and intervention by the Leninist vanguard. But its absence was not the fault of the filmmaker.

"HCUSA" is not an ostensibly revolutionary organization. It is for the workers, against the bosses and mistrustful of the union bureaucrats, to be sure; but beyond that it is a gripping and accurate documentary. It is not a propaganda statement. M.B. misunderstands the limits and potential of the documentary form, where the fundamental question we must ask is: Is it true? Does it honestly convey a sense of the traditions of our class? We think "Harlan County, U.S.A." does.

As Engels observed in a letter to Minna Kautsky:

"...the writer is not obliged to obtrude on the reader the future historical solutions of the social conflicts pictured... by conscientiously breaking down conventional illusions about them. It shatters the optimism of the bourgeois world, instills doubt as to the external character of the existing order, although the author does not offer any definite solution or does not even line up openly on any particular side."

WORKERS VANGUARD

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

EDITOR: Jan Norden

PRODUCTION MANAGER: Karen Allen

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Anne Kelley

EDITORIAL BOARD: Jon Brule, Charles Burroughs, George Foster, Liz Gordon, James Robertson, Joseph Seymour

Published weekly, except bi-weekly in August and December, by the Spartacist Publishing Co., 260 West Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10013. Telephone: 966-6841 (Editorial), 925-5665 (Business). Address all correspondence to: Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001. Domestic subscriptions: \$5.00 per year. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y.

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

4 Years in Jail, but Never Convicted Free Assata Shakur!

The fourth trial of former Black Panther Party member Assata Shakur (Joanne Chesimard) opened in New Brunswick, New Jersey, February 15 with Judge Theodore Appleby ordering the all-white jury panel of eleven women and five men sequestered for the duration. Shakur is accused of the murder of both state trooper Werner Foerster and her comrade Zayd Shakur who was shot when state troopers opened fire on a car of ex-Panthers on the New Jersey Turnpike in 1973.

In an earlier trial in the same case, Sundiata Acoli (Clark Squires), one of the Panther 21, was convicted on the same charges and is now doing life plus 24-30 years in a Trenton maximum security prison. Shakur's case was severed from his at the time, against the will of both defendants, because she was pregnant.

The bourgeois press hypocritically rails about the plight of political prisoners in the deformed workers states, but where are the cries of outrage against the treatment Assata Shakur has received at the hands of U.S. capitalist "justice"? Although she has not been convicted of a single crime, Shakur has been a political prisoner for the last four years.

She has spend the past year in solitary



Assata Shakur

UPI

incident turned out to be a paid informer, and her supposed collaborators in the second case could not pick her out of a police line-up!

This time the prosecution is leaving no stone unturned in its last chance to "get" her. The request for a change of the place of trial, made by the head of the defense team, William Kunstler, was denied. This is in spite of the findings by a National Jury Project survey that, due to the atmosphere of racial hysteria drummed up at the time of the 1973 arrest, 70-80 percent of the Middlesex County population is convinced of her guilt.

Incredibly Shakur is accused of wounding state trooper James Harper with his own gun, even though she herself was so seriously wounded that she nearly died! The defense will show medical records proving that the wounds she received are consistent with someone sitting in the back seat of the car with hands overhead.

The Shakur case stems from the nationwide round-up of Black Panther Party leaders under the FBI's Cointelpro program. In New York this campaign was primarily directed against the Cleaver wing of the organization, whose remnants formed the core of the so-called "Black Liberation Army."

Cointelpro documents show that there were 295 FBI actions directed against black groups in the late 1960's and early 1970's, 233 of them against the Black Panther Party alone. Bobby Hutton, Fred Hampton, Mark Clark, "Bunchy" Carter, John Huggins—these are only a few of those murdered in accordance with the Cointelpro "Memo on Black Nationalist Hate Groups" instructing the agents to "Prevent the rise of a 'messiah' who could unify and electrify the militant black nationalist movement."

Those militants who were not shot down on the streets were arrested under the standard policy of booking them first and finding out later whether the charges would stick. Thus the Panther 21 were acquitted within hours after the jury began deliberations on the ludicrous charge that they had plotted to blow up, among other things, the Bronx Botanical Garden! But the arrests insured the incarceration of the entire New York Black Panther Party leadership for nearly two crucial years.

Assata Shakur is a class-war prisoner, a victim of the concerted government conspiracy to "get" the Panthers. It is the responsibility of labor and socialist militants and all those concerned with defense of democratic rights to rally to her cause. Stop this vicious railroad job once and for all! Free Assata Shakur! ■

"The LSA Can't Silence Trotskyism!"

VANCOUVER—Speaking during the discussion period at a January 21 League for Socialist Action (LSA) forum here on the recent United Steelworkers presidential campaign, supporters of the Trotskyist League of Canada (TL) repeatedly forced the speaker to admit that challenger Ed Sadlowski "might betray" if elected. Embarrassed by this exposure of their darling, the LSA's bureaucratic response came in the form of a January 31 letter announcing that henceforth two TL supporters would not be permitted to attend its forums.

The next LSA forum on February 4 was met with a picket line organized by the Trotskyist League to protest this cowardly anti-communist exclusion. The dozen protesters included former LSA supporter Ken Grieves and former New Democratic Party (NDP) left-wingers Brian Campbell (the NDP's Vancouver mayoral candidate in 1972/74) and Tom Hansen. Among the chants shouted by the picketers were, "What is the LSA afraid of? Rescind the Ban on the Trotskyist League!" "Down with exclusionism, for open debate in the workers movement!" and "The League for Socialist Action can't silence Trotskyism!"

Hansen also went into the meeting to read a letter he had written (reprinted here) protesting the bureaucratic exclusions and urging all supporters of workers democracy to join the picket line. The chairman's attempts to cut short his remarks failed. In addition, the TL has initiated a petition campaign calling upon all socialists and working-class militants to protest this undemocratic exclusion.

Defend workers democracy! The LSA must rescind its anti-communist ban immediately! ■

Letter to the LSA

February 4, 1977
Vancouver, B.C.

Ms. Brenda Dineen
Director
Vanguard Forum/LSA
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Brenda and LSA members,

In response to your letter to the Trotskyist League of Canada excluding two of their comrades, Linda and Oliver, from your public forums, I am writing this protest.

Your reasons for excluding Linda and Oliver, as stated in your letter, are their conscious attempts to disrupt the Jan. 21st forum you had on Sadlowski. As you are aware I also attended that particular forum, and in my opinion the disruptions were not caused by the two TL members. Rather, they were initiated by certain LSA members when Oliver, after being recognized by the chair, walked to the front of the room to speak. In the five years that I have known the LSA, I can recall several occasions when individuals have made a practice of going to the front of the room to face the meeting when speaking, including myself. To use this as an excuse for expulsion is infantile and hypocrisy.

You also stated that Linda made an announcement when the chair adjourned the meeting which also caused a disruption. Here again I have difficulty following your line of reasoning. I could not start to count the times when LSA members have made announcements (without permission) at meetings sponsored by other organizations as they were breaking up. Furthermore, on most of these occasions the meetings were polite enough to listen to what was being said, which is more than can be said about the reaction of the LSA on Jan. 21st.

The irony of this letter lies in the fact that I have, over the years, been a vigorous and vocal defender of LSA members' rights to participate in the NDP. And I have, on several occasions, helped to work in defense campaigns on behalf of LSA'ers threatened with being expelled or refused admittance to membership in the NDP. Now I am again forced in the interest of free debate amongst the left, to oppose the tactics—which are characteristically "Stalinist"—being used against the Trotskyist League by the LSA.

As far as I am concerned, the exclusion of Oliver and Linda reflects the inability of the LSA to deal with the political criticism of the Trotskyist League. It is also a reflection of the political degeneration which is rampant in both the LSA and left groups, generally. The tactics of excluding unfavorable political viewpoints, cutting debate, character assassination, and shouting down one's opponents is a practice which is exercised by social democrats, bureaucrats and Stalinists. These tactics have no place in an organization which claims to follow the theory of Lenin and Trotsky.

I urge you to reconsider your decision.

For Open Debate...
Tom Hansen



WV Photo

Demonstrators in front of Middlesex County Courthouse demanded freedom for Assata Shakur last Monday.

confinement because the state rules she is "dangerous," even though she has been acquitted on three previous occasions of every phony charge against her. Now in maximum security isolation awaiting trial, Shakur is kept under 24-hour surveillance, locked in a basement, kept from any form of contact with other prisoners and has restricted visiting and telephone privileges. The child she had in prison four years ago was taken away from her at birth.

The state has held Assata Shakur in jail for the past four years simply by forcing her to await trial on one trumped-up charge after the other. In two bank robbery cases she was acquitted when the sole witness to the first

Young Spartacus Subscription Drive

February 1
to
February 28

Young Spartacus

MONTHLY NEWSPAPER
OF THE SPARTACUS
YOUTH LEAGUE

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

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

SUBSCRIBE NOW!
\$2/11 issues

SPARTACIST édition française
pour toute commande s'adresser à:
Pascal Alessandri Spartacist Publishing Co.
B.P. 336 Box 1377, GPO
75011 Paris New York, N.Y. 10001
FRANCE USA
3,00 F.F. \$0.75 US/Canada

Three-Ring Circus at French LCR Congress

At the end of January, the revisionist Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire (LCR) held its second national congress in Paris, attended by nearly 500 delegates. The congress opened in confusion, with the outgoing leadership's tenuous margin of control in jeopardy; no less than four formally constituted "tendencies" in addition to several informal "working groups" jockeyed for position. Only the pervasive cynicism of the organization prevented the chaos from degenerating into outright anarchy. Through some last-minute horse-trading, the discredited leadership managed to patch together a paper-thin majority when Tendency E dissolved and threw its support behind the leadership document.

With typical self-contempt, the LCR's daily *Rouge* summed up the post-congress situation with a cartoon showing two exhausted LCR members, one exclaiming, "After six months of preparation, the Congress took place" and the second replying, "It will take us six months to recover from it." The political fragmentation of the LCR majority had been codified in the creation of splintered "working groups"—which the leadership, in characteristically cynical fashion, sought to pass off as proof of the organization's "democratic functioning." The leadership's credibility was so low that some delegates were overheard openly arguing on the floor of the Congress that the only logical solution was to join the LCR's main ostensibly Trotskyist competitor in France, the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste (OCI).

While the honchos of the four official tendencies were wheeling and dealing, a hodge-podge of alienated women comrades challenged the legitimacy of the LCR's "democracy" and demanded the "right" to organize their own male-exclusionist parallel structures within the organization. The long-simmering disaffection among LCR women is a perennial threat, though an uneasy détente has thus far prevailed between this pervasive semi-organized proto-feminist current and the professional conciliators of the LCR, whose political hallmark is impressionistic adaptation to prevailing fashions on the petty-bourgeois left. The international majority of the "United" Secretariat (USec) dubs these diverse elements—among whom militant women occupy an honored position—the "broad working-class vanguard." For the USec's star section to aggressively combat the growing separatist "consciousness" of its women members would be rank apostasy. The LCR leadership is thus effectively sterilized in the face of a virtual insurrection.

The supposedly "democratic-centralist" LCR has made instability a way of life, but this time the disintegration may be terminal. Although it has survived episodic flare-ups of underlying polarization as well as endemic clique warfare, the LCR has never before been faced with a substantial faction swearing allegiance to an organized external force—in this case the USec international minority led by the reformist American SWP. And the SWP is moreover far along the road toward a marriage of convenience with

the OCI. Thus Tendency A led by Matti, having thrown in its lot with the pro-SWP OCI Tendency C, now constitutes a threat to the LCR's perspectives in France above and beyond its substantial numerical weight (roughly one-quarter) at the congress.

The outgoing leadership headed by Alain Krivine received a whopping vote of no-confidence. Krivine's Tendency D, even with the defunct Tendency E in tow, scraped up only 54.7 percent for its main resolution, while on the vote to approve the statutes it obtained a bare 50.4 percent. A document from the women's "working group" was defeated by a vote of 150 to 105, but a sizable chunk of the delegates voted with their feet, turning in 88 abstentions. This negative mandate places the LCR leadership's organizational position on a par with its political bankruptcy.

The LCR leadership has been explicit in its desire to liquidate its ostensible Trotskyist pretensions in favor of attempts to constitute a "realistic alternative" to—that is, a left-sounding pressure group upon—the popular-front Union of the Left. Tantalized by the prospect of riding the coattails of governmental power in the event of a Union of the Left electoral victory, the LCR is hell-bent on a "recomposition" (rotten bloc) of "revolutionary" forces. Ernest Mandel—who as leading light of the majority wing of the USec is the LCR's international braintruster—has already offered to abandon the "labels" of Trotskyism and the "Fourth International" to reassure the LCR's hesitant prospective bloc partners, in the first instance Michel Pablo's wing of the left-social-democratic Parti Socialiste Unifié (PSU), which disposed of roughly 22 percent of the PSU at its recent Strasbourg national conference. The LCR, unstinting in its praise of the Democrazia Proletaria electoral bloc (which lusted for an admittedly bourgeois "government of lefts") in Italy, has formed its own version for this March's municipal elections.

Rightist Opposition Consolidates

The alignment of Matti's empirical "left" opposition with the right wing of the USec internationally is another manifestation of the USec's disarray. A de facto cold split prevails between adherents of the centrist international majority (IMT) and two reformist-led oppositionists loyal to the American SWP and Argentine PST. In virtually every significant USec section, the oppositional clots which arise have sooner or later thrown in their lot with the domestic leadership's international antagonists.

Thus, Matti's Tendency A had its roots largely in the IMT-loyal "Tendency I" prior to the December 1974 first national congress of the LCR. Until shortly before the recent congress, Matti maintained an agnostic stance, refusing to side with either the IMT or the pro-SWP minority. He characterized the Union of the Left as a popular front, but whether to vote for it was deemed a "tactical" question; he granted that the LCR's Pabloist heritage should be discussed...some other time. Matti's refusal to break from the USec rotten bloc was sharply highlighted in his



LCR congress

Rouge

polemic against a group of comrades from his central power base, Rouen, who resigned from the LCR in sympathy with the international Spartacist tendency (iSt) and its French section, the Ligue Trotskyste de France (LTF), last October (see *WI* 131, 29 October 1976).

Tendency A's fusion with the much smaller Tendency C, politically controlled by pro-SWP/OCI forces, represented Matti's final abandonment of any credible claim to be a left critic. Perhaps recognizing this, a grouping of Tendency A supporters who could not stomach the SWP's social-democratic line on Portugal and other matters (the short-lived Tendency E) quit the Matti amalgam and proclaimed their loyalty to the IMT. Matti's assimilation into the SWP orbit, like the utter rout of the international "Third Tendency" at the USec's Tenth World Congress in February 1974, demonstrates the impossibility of a viable "third camp" within the USec. "Lesser evil" maneuverism within the thoroughly rotten USec is the dead end which faces those who recoil from their national leadership's manifest opportunism but refuse to draw the conclusions and break with Pabloism in all its aspects.

Tendency C's capture of Tendency A was the culmination of more than two and a half years of factional work by the SWP. In August and September of 1974, prior to the LCR's first congress, pro-SWP forces entered Tendency 4, an empirical left opposition to the IMT (much to the SWP's annoyance—it had counseled them to join Matti's Tendency 1). These forces were at that time quite hostile both to the OCI and to the SWP's characterization of the IMT as "ultra-left." As recently as the summer of 1976, a leader of the French pro-SWP tendency privately characterized the IMT as centrist, but refused to do so openly within the LCR, citing the expulsion in May of 1975 of Comrade Lafitte (now a member of the LTF) for this same "crime."

During the congress, the rapprochement of Tendency A with the OCI was blatant. When the final amendments to the Tendency A document were presented, the OCI's friends attempted to introduce characteristic OCI positions. Thus a proposal was made to include the right-wing social-democratic Force Ouvrière among the list of main targets for trade-union work. There was also an attempt to replace the "centrist" characterization of the OCI and Lutte Ouvrière by "Trotskyist." At this point, the danger of a split was so great that the spokesman for the anti-OCI forces within Tendency A made an open declaration from the podium that, despite the differences, he and his friends would not split from Tendency A. The compromise reached failed to characterize the OCI and Lutte Ouvrière in any fashion!

Tendency A's consolidation around the reformist bases of the SWP—with the perspective of joining the OCI in the short run—marks the first systematic opposition to the Krivine leadership since a faction which ultimately became Révolution (now the Organisation Communiste des Travailleurs [OCT]) left the Ligue in 1971 over the question of affiliating to the USec. The forces which have rallied to the IMT in opposition to this clearly rightist alignment are attempting to revivify Matti's agnostic stance as a left-critical pole within the IMT.

Majority Disintegrates

Faced with the emergence of a pro-SWP tendency, the majority attempted to outmaneuver it, first refusing last August to form a majority tendency, on the grounds that "working groups" were a more appropriate form for discussion than "hardened" tendencies. Beneath the would-be-democratic veneer, the intention was evidently to buy time. The leadership eventually ventured a show of strength and formed a tendency, from which groupings kept defecting right up to the time of the congress. At the opening of the congress, a motion of rampant disgruntlement was presented which proposed a three-month postponement; over ten percent of the delegates actually supported this proposal! Even Krivine's maneuverist expertise and a succession of specific patchwork amendments designed to placate one or another little clot eventually garnered the leadership only the slimmest majority.

Even the existence of a full-fledged power fight could not prevent the feminists' challenge from dominating the congress debates. At its first congress in December 1974, the Ligue had created the so-called "groupes Sand": male-exclusionist groups within the organization. After having sanctioned these formations, the LCR leadership was forced to repeatedly "remind" them that they were "informal" and could not be a parallel structure within the LCR—which is precisely what they are. The women's groups' "discussions" had reached such intensity that the central committee was obliged to vote a motion admonishing them that it was improper to slander comrades behind their backs.

A boycott of the congress was threatened if male-exclusionist groups were not permitted delegates. At the congress, a resolution was moved condemning the central committee for refusing to grant such groups "tendency" status; although the motion failed, 40 percent of those voting either favored it or abstained. The LCR leadership alternately suppressed and capitulated to the feminists.

At one point, requested by the praesidium to identify herself in the

usual fashion, one comrade hotly replied, "I am a woman!" These antics, against which the LCR's New Leftism provides no defense, recall the Lotta Continua (LC) conference which was extensively reported in *Rouge* last November. The LC conference was a virtual zoo as strident feminists and "proletarians" denounced each other for insensitivity and worse. Livio Maitan was probably looking over his shoulder at the disgruntled women of the USec when he admonished the LC women in the pages of *Inprecor* that their interests would not really be served by LC's destruction.

The feminist attacks on the leadership were only the clearest sign of the splintering of the Krivine regime into various sectors and special interest groups. Bensaid's official report on the congress, published in *Rouge* as an introduction to the congress resolutions, admits:

"Feeling its temporary impotence, the organization reacted by wanting to keep in touch with the concrete, which was translated in part by retreating into localism, by partial theoretizing, and by a tendency toward federalist conception of the revolutionary organization itself, supposedly able therefore to stick close to life.... The debate on this subject will be set off again by the first central political battle, the first turn in the conjuncture."

—*Rouge*, 9 February

Like typical bonapartist honchos, the LCR leadership does not attempt to fuse its components into a homogeneous Leninist party, but simply to play one sector off against another. Bensaid's response to the proto-feminists was to regret that "the workers' viewpoint" was not equally represented, though he acknowledged that if it had been "certain polemics might well have taken the form of social confrontation." He alleges that the "crisis of the Ligue" is quite different from that of LC in Italy, but the fact that he feels called upon to reject the comparison is eloquent in itself.

The LCR's trajectory resembles that of Lotta Continua in other respects. The LCR's recently announced electoral bloc with Lutte Ouvrière and the OCT is essentially an attempt to emulate on a smaller scale LC's participation in the Democrazia Proletaria bloc. Both are embarked on a popular-frontist course. The threadbare "leftism" of the Matti tendency is nowhere more clearly exposed than over this question; while claiming to stand for opposition to the Union of the Left, Tendency A somehow did not manage to raise at the congress the question of the March 1977 municipal elections, where the LCR leadership calls for voting for the Union of the Left on the second round!

It is therefore easy for the LCR leadership to demagogically insist:

"The immediate disagreements on the central questions did not appear clearly or were not obvious... not a single voice was raised in the Congress... to criticize or reject the united agreement made with LO and the OCT for the municipal elections... in a word, the polemic among tendencies, working groups and currents took place within a common framework."

—*Rouge*, 9 February

Bensaid is fundamentally correct. The SWP and Tendency A have appetites toward the social-democrats; the LCR leadership looks toward fusion with the openly anti-Trotskyist PSU left in order to better tail the Stalinists. Both wings are spiralling in toward the popular front on the coattails of different components of the Union of the Left. Both are fundamentally alien to the principled program of Trotskyism.

Break with Pabloism—Join the iSt!

There is an alternative to the bankrupt and fragmented LCR. But the evolution of the Matti grouping demonstrates again that there is no room in the USec for fence-straddling. To remain within the USec means choosing between a centrist majority and a reformist minority. Only a clear break with both revisionist wings can lead subjective revolutionists forward toward the construction of a genuine Trotskyist organization in France, now represented uniquely by the Ligue Trotskyste de France.

One of the Tendency A delegates to the congress, who had been an LCR supporter since 1973, resigned in the wake of the congress declaring:

"I am resigning today not for 'personal reasons' like so many comrades but on the basis of a deep political disagreement.... At the beginning of the tendency 'debates' I joined Tendency A, which seemed to me to defend more orthodox positions. In the course of the debate I came to understand that Tendency A was itself nothing but an unprincipled conglomeration.... a heterogeneous centrist bloc to the detriment of an intransigent defense of political positions.... Faced with numerous militants criticizing the IMT from the left who ended up by joining the [international minority], I was led to study the positions of the SWP. This organization has pursued an increasingly rightist course... up to the defense of the democratic rights of fascists.... the explicit abandonment of the unconditional defense of the USSR and the deformed workers states against imperialism. Today no tendency of the USec can legitimately assert that it is the continuator of the combat of the Left Opposition and the Fourth International of Leon Trotsky. The United Secretariat is not the Fourth International. 'The Tendency A comrades from Rouen, replying to the resignation of [three comrades in solidarity with the iSt], wrote, 'Yes, the question of Pabloism must be taken up sooner or later.... Only Lafitte and the Bolshevik-Leninist Faction undertook a consistent struggle against Pabloism in the LCR. They were bureaucratically expelled in May 1975. The LCR and USec cannot be reformed. Any maneuver, any rotten compromise is accepted here, except a communist opposition which dares to say the USec is not the Fourth International. The tendencies which comprise the USec maintain the unity of their unprincipled bloc only to flaunt the usurped name of the Fourth International. That is why I am resigning from the LCR to discuss with the only organization in France which seems to me today to really be struggling against Stalinism, social democracy and Pabloist revisionism to resolve the crisis of mankind, the Trotskyist League of France, sympathizing section of the international Spartacist tendency.'"

Stung by SL Criticism of "Ipi Tombi" Boycott

Guardian Advocates Political Censorship

Our recent article, "Boycott 'Ipi Tombi'" (*WV* No. 143, 4 February) has apparently struck a nerve among some of the boycotters and provoked the New Left/"Third Worldist" *Guardian* to a feeble attempt at refutation in its 16 February edition. Under the headline, "Trotskyist sects: Sparts back 'Ipi Tombi,'" the diatribe penned by one William Gurley contains a single solitary sentence (the last) with any political substance. And this is a classic example of Stalinist advocacy of political censorship to shield the masses from reactionary ideology.


Gurley quotes our statement that the movie "Green Berets" starring John Wayne could have been a good focus for mass protest against the Vietnam War, but that "to organize a general boycott of the film, to demand that people not see it, would have been an act of stupid, liberal, totalitarian moralism." Gurley's response is: "It seems that what the SL is saying is that a symbolic protest is all well and good, but if there is a chance that it can effectively prevent some piece of chauvinist and fascist propaganda from being inflicted on the masses, well that's really going too far."

Blinded by New Left moral outrage, the *Guardian* polemic completely misses the point. Such a protest would be part of a mobilization against the imperialist government's war effort, *not* an attempt to "cleanse the air" and prevent the masses from being exposed to chauvinism. Does the *Guardian* propose a boycott of all bourgeois newspapers, radio and TV shows, political speeches, comic books, musicals, etc., which incessantly barrage the American population with chauvinist propaganda of one sort or another?

Our article presented three arguments against the boycott of "Ipi Tombi." First, the musical is not a deliberate and important statement in favor of apartheid (unlike "Green Berets," which was intended as an apology for the U.S.' imperialist war), and therefore is not a suitable target for protests against Vorster's racist regime. Second, we are opposed to a general boycott of all things South African (as opposed to a boycott of military goods to South Africa), which if effective would worsen the economic deprivation of the oppressed non-white masses in that country. And third, we are opposed to political censorship of cultural events.

The assertion of national and racial superiority is a central axis of bourgeois ideology, and therefore key to capitalism. To the extent that the bourgeoisie maintains its domination through ideological mystification (e.g., religion), distortion and lies, it is necessary to combat and refute these. Mass revolutionary consciousness must be developed through exposure, protest and above all struggle based on a Marxist program which strikes at the foundations of capitalist rule. The New Left, in contrast, seeks to "cleanse" itself of petty-bourgeois guilt by boycotting whatever is deemed morally repugnant. When put into practice, this means preventing others from attending or participating, i.e., political censorship.

In their lifelong struggle against capitalism, Marx and Lenin never organized boycotts against the cultural expressions of bourgeois ideology. The Russian Orthodox church, for example,



WV Photo

Picket line outside "Ipi-Tombi" in January

was the single most important institution for keeping the masses ideologically enslaved to tsarist absolutism. The Bolsheviks produced much anti-religious propaganda and agitation, but did not attempt to physically prevent people from attending religious services. On the other hand, the destruction of churches during the Spanish civil war was associated with the petty-bourgeois anarchist movement.

Gurley's confusion is further revealed in his equation of "chauvinist" with "fascist" propaganda. Fascism is not a reactionary attitude but a movement of mass terror against the organized workers movement and oppressed minorities (such as Jews and blacks). The fascist movement, however embryonic, must be ruthlessly suppressed by militant mass action. The Spartacist League has been in the forefront of militant actions against fascists, as for example when Nazis were run off the San Francisco State campus in 1974. On the other hand, chauvinist attitudes totally permeate bourgeois ideology and culture. Only through political struggle can racist and national chauvinist prejudices be rooted out of the working masses.

In the interests of historical accuracy, we would like to clear up one of Gurley's gratuitous slanders, namely his assertion that the SL believed "the chief point of the antiwar movement of the 1960s should be to 'expose' Ho Chi Minh and the Vietnamese 'Stalinists'." The "point" of the Spartacist League's intervention into the "antiwar movement" was an uncompromising call for social revolution in South Vietnam and the ouster of the imperialists and the native capitalist class.

If Gurley would take a look at our recently published pamphlet, "Stalinism and Trotskyism in Vietnam," he would see on the back cover a telegram sent by the Spartacist editorial board to Ho Chi Minh on 7 February 1965, when U.S. bombing of North Vietnam began. It read: "Spartacist in fullest solidarity with defense of your country against attack by United States imperialism. Heroic struggle of Vietnamese working

continued on page 9

WORKERS VANGUARD

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

includes SPARTACIST

Enclosed is \$5 for 48 issues (1 year)

Enclosed is \$2 for 16 issues (4 months)—INTRODUCTORY sub

order from/pay to: Spartacist Publishing Co./Box 1377 GPO/NY, NY 10001

INTERNATIONAL RATES: 48 issues—\$20 airmail/\$5 seamail; 16 introductory issues—\$5 airmail.

Eco-Freaks vs. the Atomic Energy Lobby

Nuclear Power and the Workers Movement

by Jeff Maxwell

Since the 1973-74 Arab oil embargo and the subsequent quadrupling of the price of crude oil, nearly all of the major countries have embarked upon vigorous programs to expand the generation of electric power by means of nuclear fission reactors. Thus in 1974 the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) anticipated a 12- to 15-fold increase in nuclear generating capacity by 1985 and an additional three- to four-fold increase by the year 2000. France and Japan expected capacity to double every two years.

These programs have provoked widespread controversy, with the grounds for opposition ranging from neo-Malthusian pessimism and peasant conservatism to sober doubts on the safety of nuclear fission reactors. In West Germany, atomic power station facilities have been stormed and exploratory drilling for waste storage sites has been halted by anti-nuclear protesters. In Sweden, the Social Democratic government's program for nuclear power became *the* issue in the final days of the national election campaign last September and was an important factor in the fall of the Palme cabinet.


In the U.S., a well-financed campaign by the atomic energy lobby, strongly backed by construction unions, last year defeated six state-wide initiatives seeking to tighten controls on nuclear power plant construction. Certainly the divisions on the nuclear power issue do not fall along simple class or political lines. In Europe opposition to nuclear power comes from such disparate sources as the Norwegian government, the Dutch Labor Party, the Swedish Center Party, West German Maoists and fake-Trotskyists, the British Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution and the conservative *Economist*.

As Marxists we generally strongly support the introduction of new technology, including the development, construction and operation of nuclear fission reactors. Certainly proponents of a socialist society based on material abundance have a vastly different viewpoint on this subject than ecological crackpots who in effect seek a return to pre-industrial society. At the same time we point out that the economic advisability of nuclear fission power can only be judged within the framework of an internationally planned socialist economy.

There are very real problems of safety connected with nuclear reactors. As throughout industry, we demand union control of working conditions and, where there are specific hazards, action to shut down dangerous facilities. But beyond this we have no particular interest in determining how the bourgeoisie meets its energy needs. Those who assume that "wide public discussion" within the framework of capitalist rule will satisfactorily resolve this question are guilty of sowing the worst utopian/reactionary/pacifist illusions.


Why Nuclear Power?

The various bourgeoisies are embarking upon nuclear fission reactor programs in response to their perceived



Oregon nuclear power plant on the Columbia River.

Time



Control center at Browns Ferry nuclear power station in Alabama.

Der Spiegel

economic and military needs. Their efforts at fuel conservation have clearly failed: despite the ballyhoo surrounding Nixon's grandiose "Project Independence," U.S. imports of foreign petroleum have increased since 1973.

It is a truism that petroleum will not be abundant forever. Given current rates of consumption, a number of experts predict that supplies of natural gas and oil will come close to depletion during the next century. (Such projections must be taken with more than a grain of salt, as new reserves tend to appear whenever there is a profit to be made.) In any case, what has the imperialist rulers more immediately worried is the prospect of a sudden drop of imported petroleum supplies, a very real prospect given the intense renewal of inter-imperialist rivalry.

Among the Western powers, the move to nuclear fission power arises out of economic competition and is ultimately part of a trend toward economic autarky on the road to a new imperialist war. For smaller and economically backward capitalist nations, efforts to secure nuclear fission technology are a simple reflection of the desire to obtain

the wherewithal to construct nuclear weapons. Israel, South Africa and India are cases in point.

Certainly, current-technology nuclear reactors touch only the immediate situation and offer no solution to the gradual depletion of fossil fuels. The single-pass-through uranium "burner" uses its fuel inefficiently, liberating only 0.5 percent of the stored energy, and is therefore far from being the "ultimate" power generator. Already there are "projections" that high-grade uranium reserves will be depleted in burners by the end of the century. Thus atomic power under capitalism may very well replicate the oil "crisis," even down to the *dramatis personae*: half of all U.S. uranium reserves are owned by the oil monopolies.

Such visions of future bottlenecks are not very appetizing to the rest of the bourgeoisie. This has led to proposals for conversion to a "plutonium economy," first via the recycling of fissionable plutonium wastes created in uranium burners, followed by the development of "breeder" reactors which convert non-fissionable U-238 into plutonium and produce more fuel than they consume.

The energy gain over the current technology burners could be hundred-fold using the same fuel input. Moreover, because breeder-reactors can use lower-grade reserves, including possibly simple bedrock (U-238 comprises 99.3 percent of all uranium found in nature, and traces of it are found throughout the earth's crust), the total increase in potentially available energy would be greater by many orders of magnitude.

Who Are the Nuclear Terrorists?

The spectre of a plutonium economy has been the primary catalyst for concern in bourgeois/technical circles with nuclear conversion programs. The dominant refrain one hears is that of physicist Alvin Weinberg's "Faustian bargain": energy at the risk of survival of the species. Since the lion's share of all energy research expenditures in the U.S. recently has gone to develop a liquid metal fast breeder reactor, critics worry that an "irreversible commitment" will precede careful evaluation of the risks.

Plutonium is a high-grade weapons material. There is fear within the bourgeoisie and its technical/scientific establishment that the necessity to reprocess, store and transport plutonium opens up the possibility of nuclear blackmail by an atom-bomb-wielding "terrorist" group. This fear is being translated into official policy with the announcement by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC successor to AEC) of new security measures at nuclear facilities including guards with semi-automatic rifles and "full-field background investigations" of plant employees.

In addition, these same circles fear that export of fissionable material, reprocessing plants and/or enrichment facilities will result in the proliferation of nuclear capabilities among former colonial countries. The recent outcry engineered by the U.S. following a French sale to Pakistan of such facilities reflected the futile determination of U.S. imperialism to maintain the "big boys" semi-monopoly on nuclear terror. A

penitent Giscard has currently sworn off future transgressions.

The fears of bourgeois critics and Manhattan Project alumni that conversion to plutonium-fueled reactors will result in a proliferation of nuclear weapons are sheer hypocrisy, inasmuch as the imperialists themselves are the greatest "merchants of death." One of the most immediate results of the booming incomes of Near East oil potentates since 1973 has been a mammoth influx of sophisticated Western weaponry to the region. And it should not be forgotten that it was France and West Germany who provided a nuclear potential to South Africa, Brazil and Israel.

One of the main spokesmen for the "nuclear blackmail" critics of expanding atomic power is Theodore Taylor, a leading U.S. weapons designer in the 1950's. He is obsessed with the possibility that terrorists will divert plutonium and use it to blackmail Western "democracies" for nefarious ends. (Taylor cites the case of a 13-year-old who claimed he had built an atomic bomb—and produced an accurate sketch to back up his story—threatening to blow up Miami if the city did not hand over \$1 million.) But a more pertinent focus for Dr. Taylor's obsession would be the destructive capability he helped to provide for the U.S. bourgeoisie, which plutoniumed Nagasaki to rubble.

The greatest, most overwhelming nuclear danger confronting the world comes not from the existence of atomic power generating facilities but from the possession of nuclear weapons by the imperialist powers, first and foremost the U.S. The spread of nuclear weapons among the smaller capitalist powers does, of course, increase the danger that they will be used in national wars by desperate bourgeoisies. The threat to the world working class is obvious.

At the same time, we resolutely defend the necessity of nuclear weapons technology (including whatever attendant testing programs may be necessary) for the Soviet Union, China, Vietnam and the other deformed workers states. The answer to the dangers of nuclear war is not to be found in imperialist/social-pacifist "non-

proliferation" treaties or test bans, but in the destruction of capitalism by the revolutionary action of the international proletariat.

Bourgeois Eco-Hypocrisy


The anti-nuclear "movement" at least touches on reality with a concern for safety. Given the alacrity with which corporations cut corners in order to maximize profits while "regulatory" bodies look the other way, much more than vigilance is certainly required, since devastating nuclear "incidents" are in any case inevitable and subordination to the profit motive only tends to increase such ghastly events.

Even so, the anti-nuclear movement remains a liberal/utopian hypocritical sham and diversion precisely because it overlooks the real danger of nuclear war. The imperialists hold in their hands tens of thousands of nuclear weapons, the detonation of any one of which would in most cases make the most serious reactor accident look like a relatively minor mishap. Along with pious concern about the possibility of a major disaster arising from failure in fission reactor systems or leakages of waste storage facilities goes a touching faith in the supposed benign good will of the likes of John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, who together oversaw the butchery of millions in Southeast Asia.

The same hypocrisy, albeit on a more petty level, is shown by other fears of liberal ecologists. A case in point is the opposition to the Supersonic Transport (SST). An enormous outcry has been raised in the U.S. over the British/French Concorde SST. It's noisy and it pollutes the stratosphere we are correctly informed. So, we would hasten to point out, do the far more numerous supersonic military aircraft the U.S. military has been operating for over two decades.

The uproar whipped up over the Concorde has much less to do with the tranquility of Queens homeowners than with Boeing's sour grapes over cancellation of the American SST program and efforts to maintain the U.S.' near-monopoly on commercial aircraft con-

continued on page 8



Nuclear reactor core at Chalk River, Ontario

Der Spiegel

Conspiracy and Cover-Up in Atomic Industry

FBI Drops Inquiry in Karen Silkwood Death

The abrupt cancellation of the second Congressional investigation into FBI handling of the case of Karen Silkwood has added to a widespread belief that the facts surrounding the death of the young trade unionist two years ago are being covered up at the highest levels of industry and government. Silkwood, a laboratory technician at the Kerr-McGee plutonium processing facility in Cimarron, Oklahoma, and safety investigator for the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers union (OCAW), died in a car crash on 13 November 1974 as she was driving to meet a *New York Times* reporter.

When the hearings into her death opened last April, Congressman John Dingell, head of the House Small Business Subcommittee on Environment and Energy, stated that his staff had "reviewed hundreds of statements which raised significant questions as to the adequacy of the Federal investigations into the events" surrounding her death. But in December the hearings were abruptly canceled. An article in the 13 January *Rolling Stone* reports that the final witness to appear before the Subcommittee, an FBI informer, testified that she had reason to believe that Silkwood, in the course of investigating falsification of company safety records, had stumbled on data concerning the theft of nearly a hundred pounds of plutonium, reported missing from the plant inventory by the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) two years previously.

Silkwood, elected to the steering committee of OCAW Local 5-282, had been assigned to document the union's charges of massive company negligence in protecting plant employees from exposure to plutonium, a radioactive material so deadly that a few hundred millionths of an ounce can induce cancer of the lung. Conditions at the Cimarron facility were so bad that Dr. Karl Morgan, an expert on the dangers of nuclear radiation, later testified before the Dingell Subcommittee that between 1970 and 1974 there had been 23 reported plutonium exposures involving 89 workers at the plant, adding he had "never known an operation in the industry to be so poorly operated."

A few months before her death Silkwood and other OCAW representatives had presented to the AEC (now superseded by the Nuclear Protection Commission [NPC]) a list of 39 charges of company safety violations, most of which have since been substantiated by the Commission. Silkwood was enroute to present this documentation, and possibly new information as well, to *New York Times* reporter David Burnham, when her car mysteriously crashed. According to *Rolling Stone*, the state trooper who first discovered Silkwood's vehicle testified that he found a manila folder lying by the roadside near her car which he picked up and placed on the back seat. The folder has never been seen again.

Silkwood was exposed to radiation several times in the weeks before her death. Only days before the crash she showed evidence of contamination at work. At Silkwood's request her apartment was checked and found to be so "hot" that the entire contents had to be taken out immediately and buried! Kerr-McGee insisted that Silkwood had



Karen Silkwood

contaminated herself (!) in order to "embarrass" the company with her investigations. Moreover, the FBI, in its best J. Edgar Hoover style, "discovered" that Silkwood was bisexual, thus "proving" that any evidence she had gathered had to be unreliable.

But despite the rulings by both local police and the Justice Department that the death was accidental, OCAW has hired three separate investigators who, examining the dents on Silkwood's car, the tracks of the tires and so forth, all independently came to the same conclusion: that Silkwood's car was struck from behind by another vehicle and forced off the road. The OCAW paper summed up its position: Silkwood's death "might not have been an accident" ("Woman's Death Linked to A-Plant Safety Query," OCAW *Union News*, December 1974).

The Silkwood case caught the interest of both women's and ecology groups who in 1975 formed Supporters of Silkwood (SOS) to pressure for a Congressional investigation. The National Organization of Women declared "Karen Silkwood Day" on the first anniversary of her death and collected 8,500 signatures in favor of reopening the case. In late 1975 the groups succeeded in convincing Senator Lee Metcalf, a liberal Montana Democrat, to hold hearings through the Government Operations Subcommittee he heads. But the chairman of the board of Kerr-McGee then flew to Washington and met privately with Metcalf who subsequently announced he would give up the investigation. The case was then turned over to Dingell who was interested in pursuing it primarily because he had an old score to settle with Senator Robert Kerr, an old political rival of his father and a founder of Kerr-McGee.

New evidence was brought to light through the Dingell hearings, in particular raising again the question of the disappearance of a massive amount of plutonium. A cover-up was hinted at again when free-lance journalist and admitted FBI informer Jacques Srouji testified that she had seen 1,000 pages of documents gathered by the original FBI investigator, Larry Olson, on which basis she said she was "surprised" the Justice Department had closed the case.

continued on page 9

Nuclear Power ...

(continued from page 7)

struction in the capitalist world. The real problem with the Concorde is its small passenger capacity.

Hypocrisy aside, there is a material basis for the bourgeoisie's increased "ecological" awareness, including its belated but genuine fears about the safety of nuclear power plants. Quite simply it has been found that the operation of many modern industries exposes not only the proletarians but all classes of society, including the bourgeoisie, to the deleterious effects of industrial pollution.

A severe accident in even a remote nuclear power plant might expose thousands to dangerous doses of radioactivity, including those residing in posh suburbs miles from the site of the plant. Whereas the capitalists disregard the most appalling working conditions in their plants, they do worry when pollutants from an industrial process are shown to effect not only their wage slaves but also themselves.

The Safety Question

The principal dangers attendant upon the operation of nuclear power plants are two. Should all reactor cooling systems fail, the reactor core will melt. This could ultimately lead to the release of enormous amounts of lethal radiation. No such "maximum credible accident" has occurred, although there have been any number of lesser cooling system malfunctions. Loss of coolant in a breeder reactor would be potentially even more destructive. The concentrations of plutonium in such a facility are great enough to allow the possibility of a low-grade explosion which would liberate tons of radioactive debris and explosive molten sodium.


Waste disposal is the second major problem. Plutonium, which is highly toxic, has a half-life of 24,000 years and must be isolated from the biosphere for several hundred thousand years. The U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) says that the technology exists to safely store highly radioactive wastes and permanent storage sites are being constructed in salt beds, but leaks have occurred at temporary sites.

The technical debate on safety has become a hysterical exercise in obfuscation—both by government and industry scientists and their opponents in the environmentalist movement. The resignation, shortly before the California referendum last June, of three General Electric engineers and an NRC safety inspector protesting against inadequate safety in the atomic power industry was met by a ringing endorsement of nuclear power by a panoply of Nobel physics laureates.

Likewise, the release of the "definitive" Rasmussen Report by the AEC, which ascribed a minute probability to a "maximum credibility accident," was countered by a number of scientists who doubted the quoted odds. The most extreme case of anti-nuclear anxiety has been in West Germany, where opponents of atomic power are publicizing as good coin the wildly exaggerated "findings" of a speculative government study which talks of 30 million dead as a possible result of a nuclear reactor disaster.

We do not wish to take a position on the technical issues involved, nor do we offer suggestions to capitalism as to which method of energy generation it would do best to use. As the recent natural gas "shortage" proves, the anarchy of production under capitalism makes the energy "crisis" inevitable.

Capitalism also makes it difficult to choose a lesser evil. Pollution from the burning of sulfur-bearing coal and oil probably results in thousands of deaths *per year*. Moreover, deaths among coal miners in the U.S. from industrial



Old salt mine used to dispose of nuclear waste in Germany.

accidents and black lung disease are notoriously high (although West European, Polish and Soviet mines have drastically reduced them). As to major disasters, the collapse of a hydroelectric dam above Sacramento could result in an estimated 260,000 deaths. The near collapse of the Lower San Fernando dam in 1971 threatened 80,000 lives. Both the probability of occurrence and probable destruction from such a catastrophe could greatly exceed those of the "maximum credible accident." When one adds up deaths from sulfide pollution, mine accidents, black lung, dam collapses, etc., there is no guarantee that by reliance on fossil fuels and hydroelectric energy overall safety would be increased compared to widespread use of nuclear power. In fact, atomic power might well be safer.

We are in favor of safety everywhere and denounce capitalism's inability to provide it. On the one hand, evidence is lacking of a generalized danger posed by atomic energy of the sort that would be necessary to justify an outright ban on construction or operation of nuclear power facilities, as demanded by West German demonstrators, or even a generalized moratorium. On the other hand, we support the thrust of those recent voter initiatives which sought to remove the ceiling on corporate liability for nuclear accidents and restrict plant sitings prior to an adequate investigation of specific reactor safety and waste disposal hazards.

Such measures, which entrust final determinations to the state legislatures are certainly no guarantee of safety. The legacy of the nuclear industry—from the use of radioactive tailings for construction in Grand Junction, Colorado, to the death of Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers safety inspector Karen Silkwood under suspicious circumstances (see accompanying article)—is an abomination. We demand trade-union control of safety conditions in all industrial situations.

Capitalists Back Off From Nuclear Power

Of course, decaying capitalism cannot deal with the gradual depletion of fossil fuel reserves. But the conversion to nuclear power for all electricity does not even pose the glimmer of an answer. Only one third of projected energy consumption for the year 2000 is for electricity. The rest—energy for transportation, space heating, industrial processes—will still be dependent upon fossil fuels.

The bourgeoisie's recent interest in nuclear power is in part based on the fact that (at least in France and the U.S.) it is now competitive with energy output from coal-burning plants. But the nuclear industry is itself increasingly shaky. The cost of nuclear power is skyrocketing. The price of uranium has quadrupled since 1973; the estimated capital investment for a 1,000-megawatt plant will have quadrupled within ten years. And there remains the unknown but necessary cost of decommissioning a reactor.

These costs, the propensity to relax

pollution standards in the face of corporate complaints, the relative stabilization of petroleum prices and the promise of endless legal battles have had their impact on the plans for nuclear power. Thus while the political issue remains significant in a number of countries, there are signs that the bourgeoisie is having second thoughts.

Most significantly, in the U.S. no new orders for nuclear reactors were placed in 1976 and both Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter advocated a several-year delay in the full-blown commitment to plutonium. The British Commission on Environmental Pollution, buoyed by sanguine visions of North Sea oil, recommended a similar delay. At the same time, however, environmentalists could take little solace from Jimmy Carter's appointment as his energy adviser of all-purpose hawk James Schlesinger (who headed the AEC before moving on to the CIA and then the Defense Department).

While waffling is feasible for the U.S. and Britain, France's options are considerably more restricted; its resources are fewer and its commitment to a breeder program, the Phénix, is much greater. However, Giscard hoped to finance this program through the export of technology, a plan which appears less than acceptable to his NATO friends.

Neo-Malthusian Pessimists

There have been a number of alternatives proposed to the generation of nuclear power through fission—solar energy, fusion power, geothermal power, tidal power, oil from shale and windmills. Of these, a number have yet to be developed, partially because their development has not been adequately funded, while others require such massive initial capital and energy investments that their profitability is problematic in the short run. The real option at present is between coal (which will be abundant for centuries) and nuclear power.

The more pessimistic of the bourgeois critics such as the Ford Foundation's Energy Policy Project have urged massive economic changes to approach "zero energy growth" (ZEG). The Ford panel's suggestions are utopian in the extreme, assuming the validity of dubious economic models and a rationality which capitalism does not possess. For example, an important aspect of ZEG is the de-emphasis of the automobile in urban centers. This idea is not new nor is it necessarily invalid in the abstract. The hitch is that capitalist reality is moving in the opposite direction, i.e., toward the increased cost and decay of mass transit.

A number of environmentalists have also adopted a "zero-growth" position. Without the Ford Foundation's dubious econometrics, this is more realistically seen as a call for austerity. Thus the British magazine *Ecologist* lauds primitive societies and contains a lengthy polemic against Marxism which perceives socialism as founded upon what for a zero-growther is anathema—material abundance based upon advanced technology.

Ignored by the well-fed, well-paid "zero-growth" proponents is the fact that the overwhelming majority of humanity lives in abject poverty. Thus an environmentalist must recoil in horror from the prospect of a qualitative breakthrough in the worldwide standard of living such as would occur after an international proletarian revolution. Both per capita and total energy consumption must be orders of magnitude higher under socialism than they are under capitalism.

Most importantly, calls for zero growth as the solution to energy problems can only intersect the austerity program of a capitalist economy in a period of contraction. Unfortunately some in the left show little appreciation of this. Thus the Swiss section of Ernest Mandel's fake-Trotskyist United Secretariat (USec) sees in the zero growth movements "a promising dynamic," in that their "mass actions in practice challenge the normal functioning of the system." To experience this "promising dynamic" in practice one need only look to Sweden where the bourgeois Center Party's anti-nuclear "green dream" of rustic austerity helped provide a vehicle for the defeat of the Social Democratic government. The Swedish USec group's response was to accuse the Center Party of being insufficiently categorical in opposing atomic power.

Nuclear power is neither Pandora's box nor a panacea. It suffers the same fate as all other forms of technology under a system where the relations of production and national boundaries act as barriers to the development of the productive forces. There is no solution to the "energy crisis" under capitalism. In the short run, the working class suffers the pollution and shortages resulting from the anarchy of supply and distribution under capitalist production; in the long run it will feel the equally nefarious effects, environmental and economic, of the absence of rational scientific allocation of resources and technology.

The historical pessimism expressed by the zero-growthers does not reflect a law of nature but rather is deeply rooted in bourgeois society. The physical possibilities for energy production are virtually unlimited. The main known power source in the universe is nuclear fusion—the conversion of hydrogen to helium (i.e., the energy emitted by the sun, or as a local and episodic example, explosion of a hydrogen bomb). The obvious task of mankind is to obtain a direct and controlled access to this fundamental energy source.

What is required to realize these potentialities is an international proletarian revolution which will establish a social order where production is designed to satisfy human need. Half a century ago, some 16 years before Enrico Fermi succeeded in achieving the first controlled fission reaction, Leon Trotsky said of nuclear power:

"The atom contains within itself a mighty hidden energy, and the greatest task of physics consists of pumping out this energy, pulling out the cork so that this hidden energy may burst forth in a fountain. Then the possibility will be opened up of replacing coal and oil by atomic power. This is not at all a hopeless task. And what prospects it opens up before us! This alone gives us the right to declare that scientific and technical thought is approaching a great turning point, that the revolutionary epoch in the development of human society will be accompanied by a revolutionary epoch in the sphere of the cognition of matter and the mastering of it."

—"Radio, Science, Technology and Society," March 1926

But unleashing the energy locked in the atom's nucleus has proved an easier task to accomplish than installing the proletarian dictatorship throughout the world. We are left with a tremendous concentration of nuclear destructive capacity in the hands of the rapacious imperialists, making even more pressing the crisis of revolutionary leadership and very real indeed the choice posed by Marx: socialism or barbarism. ■

WORKERS VANGUARD

Asylum for Anti-CIA Journalists!

Britain Moves to Deport Agee, Hosenball

LONDON, February 20—Last Wednesday, British home secretary Merlin Rees announced in parliament that the Labour government intends to go ahead with the threatened deportation of two American journalists—Mark Hosenball, who works for the London daily *Evening Standard*, and Philip Agee, the former CIA agent and author of the



Philip Agee

Terence Spencer

best-selling exposé of U.S. imperialism's secret police agency, *Inside the Company: CIA Diary*.

The deportations are manifestly an attempt to curtail freedom of the press and to prevent any investigation of the murderous intrigue of the imperialist spy agency. Only three days after Rees' announcement, the Special Branch used the power of the Official Secrets Act to detain three men who were active in the work of the Agee-Hosenball Defense Committee in connection with inquiries into an alleged leak of secret information.

In upholding the deportation order,

Rees repeated the original vague accusations against the two. Agee is accused of maintaining regular contact with foreign intelligence agencies, disseminating information harmful to Britain's security and aiding others to obtain such information for publication. Hosenball is accused of obtaining information for publication harmful to the national security and prejudicial to the safety of the "servants of the Crown." Neither man has been given any further information on the exact charges against them, and Rees refused to divulge anything more on the grounds that "the slightest information would have put at risk and made it easy to identify people from whom we got the information."

Since the original deportation orders were issued in November, both Agee and Hosenball have appeared before the Home Office Advisory Committee, and utterly fraudulent "appeal" body, whose only power is to "advise" the Home Secretary. During the hearings, neither man was informed in detail of the charges against them and thus they were only able to guess at what they were "guilty" of. The tribunal was closed, without even the minimum of judicial safeguards; the accused had no proper legal representation and the tribunal publishes neither its proceedings nor its findings.

Rees claims that "there has never been any representation from the American government or any American agency." Agee maintains however that the home secretary's action represents a "capitulation" of the British government to pressure from the United States, and is part of a general witchhunt of Agee and others who have investigated the sordid activities of the CIA.

The case of Hosenball indicates that it

is not just the CIA which persecutes any who might dare to stick their noses into the work of the imperialist spy agencies. Hosenball argues that he is being deported because of an article in *Time Out*, a trendy London weekly guide to entertainment, which described methods of monitoring radio and telephone messages and gave the location in Britain of listening sites. Two paragraphs of the article suggested that the IRA had been using radio signals to detonate bombs and that if the army could capture the signal, they would detonate the bombs themselves. Reportedly, the Home Office Advisory Committee closely questioned Hosenball in connection with these passages. The



Mark Hosenball

Angela Phillips

London Times (18 February) claims to have been told in November that the deportation might be connected with Northern Ireland and the naming of British agents.

Significantly, one of the three men detained by the Special Branch on Saturday is a free-lance journalist, Duncan Campbell, who gave evidence to the Home Office tribunal and who claims to be the actual author of the *Time Out* article. According to Campbell, all the information for the article is freely available and in particular the information for the citing of communications centers can be obtained in telephone books!

Another of those arrested on Saturday was an ex-serviceman, John Berry. Berry served with the Signals Corps from 1966 to 1970 where he worked on monitoring diplomatic and military radio traffic and was a special intelligence analyst directly concerned with processing information gained from the interception of radio signals. Since Rees' announcement, both men have announced plans to fight the deportations in the courts.

Over 80 Labour MPs have signed a petition condemning the deportation decision. The Agee-Hosenball Defense Committee has called for a demonstration on March 5, and asked all transport unions to refuse to work any craft taking the men from the country. All class-conscious militants must oppose the deportations of Agee and Hosenball, and demand the immediate release of the three detained supporters of the Agee-Hosenball Defense Committee. Down with the imperialist spy and secret police agencies, from the FBI/CIA/NSA to the Special Branch/M15/M16! ■

Silkwood...

(continued from page 7)

ment had closed the case.

Olson was brought in to testify before a closed session of the Committee, but after that the FBI and Justice Department refused to cooperate further. They said they could not testify because they are presently being sued by Silkwood's parents for conspiracy to violate her civil rights. Shortly afterwards Dingell cancelled the hearings. Furthermore, that same month a call-girl suspected of gangland connections coincidentally announced that Dingell was one of her clients, thus creating a scandal which gave the House Democratic Caucus an excuse to strip the Small Business Subcommittee chairmanship away from Dingell.

Whether there is anything behind *Rolling Stone's* hints of cloak-and-dagger plutonium-smuggling conspiracies will most likely never be known. But her documentation of company negligence and falsification of safety records was damning to powerful interests and as long as the bourgeois courts and commissions are running the investiga-

tions of her death, the only results will be successive cover-ups of the cover-ups.

As the hundreds of thousands of industrial accidents and deaths incurred every year by American workers demonstrate, the capitalists are not interested in the safety of their employees, particularly when adequate safety precautions stand in the way of profits. In the nuclear industry such dangers are magnified enormously. The safety of the workers cannot be left in the hands of

the capitalists, but must be protected by union safety committees with the power to close down hazardous plants. The complicity of the AEC/NPC with the profit-greedy nuclear industry proves that the disregard for human life and safety which extends from tiny sweatshops to the most technologically advanced industry to callous government welfare programs will continue until a revolutionary workers government sweeps away the capitalist system. ■

Guardian...

(continued from page 5)

people furthers the American revolution."

Of course, we also pointed to the well-documented betrayals of the Stalinist Ho, such as welcoming the "democratic" imperialists back to Vietnam after the fall of Japan, stabbing the 1945 Saigon workers insurrection in the back and murdering its Trotskyist leaders. But while calling for political revolution to oust the Hanoi bureaucrats who repeatedly sought accommodation with imperialism (and abandoned their southern followers to the tender mercies of Diem in 1955), we never wavered in our defense of the North Vietnamese deformed workers state against the imperialist attack. We were, as readers of the *Guardian* may recall, the *only* political tendency to raise the banner, "All Indochina Must Go Communist!"

The *Guardian's* arguments for boycotting "Ipi Tombi" represent an intersection of New Left moralism with Stalinist censorship. But the *Guardian* editors might consider for a minute how they would be treated by Stalinist bureaucrats in power who follow their prescription for "Ipi Tombi." If Gurley and his colleagues attempted to distribute the *Guardian*, suitably translated, on the streets of Havana or Peking, it would undoubtedly be suppressed as "counterrevolutionary" or even "fascist" propaganda. In Castro's Cuba, the *Guardian* would be suppressed for the crime of "anti-Sovietism," while in Maoist China it would be banned as apologizing for "Soviet social-imperialism" (e.g., over Angola)!

Nevertheless, as consistent adherents to workers democracy, the Spartacist League can assure the *Guardian* editors that we would defend them should they run afoul of the Stalinist bureaucratic political censorship they proclaim. ■

SPARTACIST LEAGUE LOCAL DIRECTORY

- ANN ARBOR(313) 769-6376
c/o SYL, Room 4316
Michigan Union, U. of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
- BERKELEY/
OAKLAND(415) 835-1535
Box 23372
Oakland, CA 94623
- BOSTON(617) 492-3928
Box 188
M.I.T. Station
Cambridge, MA 02139
- CHICAGO(312) 427-0003
Box 6441, Main P.O.
Chicago, IL 60680
- CLEVELAND(216) 281-4781
Box 6765
Cleveland, OH 44101
- DETROIT(313) 869-1551
Box 663A, General P.O.
Detroit, MI 48232
- HOUSTON
Box 26474
Houston, TX 77207
- LOS ANGELES(213) 385-1962
Box 26282, Edendale Station
Los Angeles, CA 90026
- MADISON
c/o SYL, Box 3334
Madison, WI 53704
- NEW YORK(212) 925-2426
Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York, NY 10001
- PHILADELPHIA
c/o SYL, P.O. Box 13138
Philadelphia, PA 19101
- SAN DIEGO
P.O. Box 2034
Chula Vista, CA 92012
- SAN FRANCISCO(415) 564-2845
Box 5712
San Francisco, CA 94101
- TROTSKYIST LEAGUE OF CANADA
- TORONTO(416) 366-4107
Box 7198, Station A
Toronto, Ontario
- VANCOUVER(604) 291-8993
Box 26, Station A
Vancouver, B.C.

Spartacus Youth League Pamphlet

China's Alliance with U.S. Imperialism

Price: \$1

Order from/pay to: Spartacus Youth Publishing Co., P.O. Box 825, Canal St. Station, New York, N.Y. 10013

Rhodesia...

(continued from page 1)

increasingly adept at sabotage and able to operate widely in the "tribal trust" lands which comprise about half the country. The opening last year of new infiltration points along some four fifths of the country's border has stretched government troops precariously thin. The influx of sophisticated Soviet weapons—recoilless rifles, mortars and anti-tank guns—and the ability to operate freely out of Samora Machel's Mozambique have allowed the guerrillas to intensify their activities in the past year beyond the low-level harassment and occasional ambushes that characterized the "war" up to early 1976. Rocket attacks on major roads, outlying towns and government military positions are frequent and becoming more effective. The discovery of a guerrilla camp near the eastern border with Mozambique sparked a running three-day battle in mid-December.

Ultimately, the fate of white supremacy is sealed by the sheer numerical weight of the black population. Although half the government's armed forces are well-paid black volunteers, it dares not draft Africans and is limited to conscription among the 270,000 whites. Despite heavy losses, the guerrillas' ranks continue to grow with fresh reinforcements from youths who leave the rural mission schools to fight for majority rule.

The Zambian-based forces led by Joshua Nkomo, longtime head of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), have in particular been augmented in recent months since the opening of a guerrilla front in Matabeleland, the western Rhodesian province reserved for Nkomo's native tribe. The ZAPU military operations are intended not only to isolate the government but to strengthen Nkomo's hand if his "Patriotic Front" with Robert Mugabe's Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) falls apart. This alliance between old political enemies was cemented by the five "front-line" Afri-

can states anxious to milk Nkomo's access to Soviet aid while joining ZAPU forces to the large ZANU army based in Mozambique.

Imperialist Lies and Racist Hypocrisy

Nkomo's recent success in bolstering his military strength prompted Salisbury officials to charge that ZAPU is abducting hundreds of teenage youths. The British press, using rhetoric left over from the days of the Malayan and Kenyan colonial "emergencies," worked itself into a frenzy: "Nkomo men launch mass kidnapping drive to build up



Rhodesian guerrillas

terrorist army" blared a headline in the London *Times* (21 January). Early this month, however, the shrill charges exploded in Smith's face. He had secured the co-operation of the Red Cross, the Botswana government and the parents to "rescue" 400 students allegedly forced at gunpoint to enter Botswana en route to training camps in Zambia. However, when the bus caravan arrived with great fanfare to pick up the youths, their parents were able to dissuade only about 50 from going north to join the guerrillas.

These youths, newly released from the paternalist control of religious schools, exchange textbooks for guns and are sent into the field with at best a few days' training. Such forces are neither very skilled nor very disciplined. Allowing for a significant margin of self-serving inflation, this accounts in part for the government's superior "kill ratio" and perhaps also for individual atrocities such as the killing of the Catholic missionaries.

But while the world bourgeois press screamed in outrage over the deaths of seven priests and nuns, Smith's storm-troopers in one week butchered 12 "curfew breakers" and 16 other civili-

ties simultaneously too large and economically entrenched to be relegated to political impotence (as in Kenya) and too small to impose a puppet black regime.

"White Rhodesia" could only be saved through a major South African military/economic bail-out and the connivance of the major imperialist powers to whom Salisbury addresses its propaganda. By flaunting the banner of defense of civilization against "godless communism" and "savagery," Smith and his supporters hope to save their doomed "way of life." The endless stream of guerrilla atrocity stories is accompanied by the government's whitewash of its own wanton butchery. On top of this is the ludicrous spectacle of Rhodesian foreign minister Pieter van der Byl attempting to portray the Geneva conference as a latter-day Munich and its British chairman, Ivor Richard, as a spineless Neville Chamberlain:

"There comes that moment that came to England in 1940 where the total bowing of the neck to the conquerors' heel is too intolerable to contemplate and you fight to the last man and the last cartridge."

—*New York Times*, 13 January

But the time is past when the image of "plucky little Rhodesia" will go over in Washington or London. Bourgeois *realpolitik* tells the imperialists to write off the colonial settler state as an anachronism and strike a deal with bourgeois nationalist elements. The capitalist powers, moreover, are well aware that Rhodesian whites have qualitatively less capacity than the South African to wage a genocidal last stand. They are a far smaller minority in both absolute and relative terms, nowhere as close as South Africa to economic and military self-sufficiency, and are not historically entrenched on the continent like South African whites. A majority of Rhodesia's whites are post-World War II immigrants—mostly British—and many still hold U.K. passports. A significant number of the rest are Afrikaners with ties to South Africa. In the near future Rhodesia will either have a black government or become a launching pad for a major international confrontation à la Angola.

The international workers movement must actively combat any attempt to aid the racist killers in Salisbury—whether it take the form of mercenary recruitment, covert military or economic assistance, a "humanitarian" military intervention like the UN Congo operation, or the daily lies and half-truths of the bourgeois press. The destruction of Smith's racist rule is in the interest of the world proletariat, and the workers movement must support military victory for the nationalist guerrillas against the oppressor white settler regime.

But confining the struggle within the narrow framework of bourgeois nationalism will not liberate the black masses from poverty and wage slavery. On the morrow of victory, the Nkomos and Mugabes will prove as implacable class enemies of the workers and peasants as the white settlers. Only through the establishment of a Zimbabwe black workers and peasants government in the framework of a socialist federation of southern Africa, will industry and agriculture be put in the service of the oppressed. This requires construction of a Trotskyist party and concrete links with the massive and combative black proletariat of South Africa. ■

Down with the Shah— Defend the Iranian 18!

On February 15 six supporters of the Iranian Student Association (ISA) and the Revolutionary Student Brigade (RSB) chained themselves inside the crown of the Statue of Liberty and dropped a banner from the windows proclaiming "Free the 18" and "Down with the Shah." The action was to publicize the case of 18 oppositionists rounded up during savage attacks last November 16 and December 21 against leftists (branded "Marxist

guerrillas") in Teheran.

An ISA spokesman says several of the oppositionists have already been executed and the rest are being held prisoner in the Shah's torture chambers awaiting trial as "terrorists." In addition to the prisoners, ten others were murdered in the bloody gun battles which led to their capture. Among those executed are members of the Confederation of Iranian Students in Foreign Countries and the Organization of People's Combatants.

The occupation was also a protest against the use of the CIA-trained Iranian secret police—SAVAK—to monitor the activities of Iranian students in the U.S. While there is a furor in the press over the so-called "Koreagate" (the success of South Korean CIA agents in bribing U.S. Congressmen), almost nothing is reported about the long-standing operations by the SAVAK who shadow Iranian students and arrange deportations of known leftists back to Iran where they are imprisoned and often subjected to prolonged and hideous torture. According to a November 1976 statement by Amnesty International, there are presently 25,000 to 100,000 political prisoners in Iran.

The Spartacist League and the Partisan Defense Committee call for the immediate release of all class-war prisoners held by the Shah's police state. Free the 18!

ans, eight of them women, accused of "running with terrorists" (*New York Times*, 14 February). To cap the rampant hypocrisy, the government dried its tears long enough to sentence Catholic bishop Donal Lamont to ten years in prison because he had instructed a missionary nurse (for her own protection) to not report guerrilla activities.

The *New York Times* this week provided a rather more ludicrous example of two-faced imperialist "morality." A 17 February editorial applauded the Carter administration's admonition to Congress to repeal the Byrd amendment permitting the import of Rhodesian chrome. The logic was simple: technological innovations have reduced the U.S.' need for Rhodesian high-grade chrome and closure of the Mozambique/Rhodesia border in March has cut off the supply anyway! With absolutely nothing to lose, say these liberal pundits, the U.S. can now join the impotent UN boycott as a "diplomatic" gesture to "at last lay an essential foundation for restoring our credibility" in Africa.

Defending "White Rhodesia"

Smith's propaganda campaign will certainly not win over Rhodesian blacks. Nor is it intended to. Such products as the government booklet, "Harvest of Fear"—accusing the guerrillas of "horrific acts of murder, mutilation and even cannibalism"—are mainly for export. Their aim is to cauterize liberal imperialist sympathies for the Nkomo, Mugabe alliance after Smith's scuttling of the Geneva talks. He is now pursuing an "internal settlement" with the reactionary tribal chiefs recently organized in the Zimbabwe United People's Organization and angling for a deal with Bishop Abel Muzorewa, the nationalist leader who was outmaneuvered by his rivals at Geneva.

The so-called "Marxist" guerrillas, while they are by no means socialist, nevertheless cannot construct a black bourgeois regime without attacking the economic as well as political bases of white-supremacist rule. The talk of a "Kenyan" solution is only a pipedream, for the white minority will not countenance a black-dominated regime out of fear for their plantations, businesses, bureaucratic posts and economic privileges. The white Rhodesian population



Hosefros/New York Times

London Spartacist Group Forum

Leninism: The National Question and Ireland

Speaker: DAVID STRACHAN
Friday, March 11, 1977 7:00 p.m.
Conway Hall, Red Lion Square
WC1

LONDON

Pitched Battle over Nuclear Power Plant in Germany...

(continued from page 1)

and order," these official thugs proceeded to club and mace sit-downers after the main body of demonstrators had departed. Those who attempted to flee were brutally attacked and then booked for "resisting arrest." An open-air religious vigil against the atomic power plant, held several kilometers from the construction site, was first buzzed by police helicopters, then subjected to an airborne tear-gas assault. Among those subjected to these strong-arm tactics were a number of local and state bourgeois politicians who had joined the protest.

The Citizens Initiative is by no means a radical group, but rather an umbrella organization set up by local residents (primarily milk farmers and nouveaux riches with country homes) and liberal professionals concerned about the danger of contamination by atomic radiation. With the increasing shift to nuclear energy in West Germany (already a dozen reactors are functioning), such groups have been spreading rapidly. At the town of Wyhl on the upper Rhine repeated demonstrations and confrontations with the police succeeded in halting construction of a planned atom power plant.

Determined that Brokdorf would not turn into another Wyhl, the Christian Democratic state government of Schleswig-Holstein has fortified the plant site so that it now looks like a World War II POW camp. In addition to the arsenal of armored cars, helicopters and water cannons, the property is surrounded by a 3-meter-high wall topped by a 2.5-meter-high wire-mesh fence. In front of the wall is a five-meter-wide moat and an initial barrier of rolled barbed wire. To add to the surrealist

atmosphere, below the sign announcing that the site is private property is a second notice beginning, "our Brokdorf power plant..."

To justify the wanton police assault, broadcast in "living color" on West German television, Schleswig-Holstein's state prime minister Gerhard Stoltenberg claimed, "It was easy to see early on that increasingly radical, in part communist, forces directed from the outside had gained influence..." (*Der Spiegel*, 15 November). The state prosecutor's office at Itzehoe last week exonerated Stoltenberg from any criminal charges in the October 30 and November 11 shock-troop attacks on the peaceful demonstrators, but public opinion polls report that a large percentage of the population was horrified by the police assault.

Power and Profit

According to the pro-SPD *Der Spiegel* (14 February), the same polls show 47 percent of the West German public opposed to further construction of atomic power generating plants. This sentiment has doubtless been fed by the publication of alarmist reports, in the 13 January *Stern*, citing supposedly official secret documents that talk of 30 million dead—i.e., half the entire West German population—in the event of a major nuclear plant catastrophe. But leaked reports of disaster contingency plans that call for the evacuation of a few prominent citizens and the sealing off of everyone else (if necessary by panzer divisions!) have certainly contributed to anti-nuclear sentiment.

Why is the West German bourgeoisie pushing atomic power so strongly? Of course, there are large profits for industrial giants such as Siemens who make millions of marks from state-subsidized research and can easily recoup massive "cost overruns" because of unanticipated technical problems. But low-cost German coal is readily available in vast quantities. The real interest is far more political: the German big bourgeoisie has never been reconciled to being simply a vassal of U.S. imperialism.

West Germany's expanding economic muscle has dominated the Common Market, so that Giscard must keep good relations with Schmidt and crisis-ridden Italy must submit to political conditions (no Communists in the government) in order to receive multi-billion-mark loans to bolster its precarious balance of payments position. Bonn has turned to atomic power to reduce German dependence on Near East oil, whose distribution is controlled by the U.S.-dominated "seven sisters" oil cartel. It also seeks to export nuclear power plants to backward countries in return for economic privileges.

While France and Germany have (for now) retreated under pressure from Washington in their aggressive export of atomic reactors, West Germany is now the only other capitalist country besides the U.S. which can deliver complete nuclear power plants. Moreover, its production is not profitable unless it assembles six plants per year, and domestic demand does not exceed three. The 5 February *Welt*, mouthpiece of reactionary press magnate Axel Springer and spokesman for the most revanchist sectors of the West German bourgeoisie, blustered:

"Without a Franco-German entente there can be no united Europe. It is therefore incomprehensible why the new American administration apparently intends to use one of the most extensive sectors of competition among industrialized nations, the export of peaceful nuclear energy, as a lever to break up this understanding.... The French and the Germans now have a spectacular opportunity to demonstrate their unity and to defend common positions against American pressure...."

The imperialist competition is coming to the fore in current negotiations in Washington in which the State Department is trying to get Bonn to abrogate a

16-billion-mark deal for construction of four nuclear power plants and uranium enrichment/reprocessing facilities for plutonium production in Brazil. The Americans are threatening no more uranium shipments to West Germany, but part of the Brazilian deal is for West German participation in the exploitation of uranium ore deposits. A 1976 West German/Indonesian "technology exchange" agreement likewise called for German sharing in uranium production in West Sumatra. To the pressures of the Carter administration, West German under-secretary of foreign affairs replied categorically: "We're not contract breakers. We'll keep to our agreements."

New Left/Liberal Alliance

The widespread opposition to construction of new atom-powered electricity plants in West Germany has disconcerted the ruling coalition in Bonn, but it quickly inserted the anti-nuclear protests into the on-going witchhunt against "extremists." This includes the lengthy show trial of the anarchist Red Army Faction (referred to in the bourgeois press as the "Baader-Meinhof gang"), and the infamous *Berufsverbot* (prohibition of public employment to "radicals"). Now the SPD and Christian Democratic leaders are presenting the protests against atomic power as "communist manipulated."

At the same time, social-democratic union tops have been able to mobilize hundreds of workers (mostly from the affected power industry) in counter-demonstrations against the environmentalist protests. Faced with the demand, "No atom power plant at Brokdorf or anywhere else," the workers are quite justified in fearing that jobs are threatened by eco-freaks willing to plunge the country into an energy crisis which would result in widespread plant shutdowns. SPD leaders can also point to the example of Sweden, where petty-bourgeois environmentalists mounted a campaign against nuclear power that played into the hands of the bourgeois opposition parties and brought down the Social Democratic government last autumn.

The international Spartacist tendency and its German section, the Trotskistische Liga Deutschlands, are sharply opposed to "back-to-nature," anti-industrial ecology fads, which constitute an attack on the material foundations for proletarian revolution. While protesting the vicious police brutality at Brokdorf, we do not support the demonstrations against atomic power.

Virtually the entire West German left has instead enthusiastically jumped on the anti-nuclear bandwagon. The Maoist KBW, KPD and KPD-ML as well as the semi-Maoist KB played a prominent role in organizing the attempted occupation of the Brokdorf construction site, hoping to revive the spirit of the

New Left student movement of the late 1960's. Tactically they have oscillated between adventurist folly (the KBW reportedly wished to storm the police barricades on Saturday) and purely symbolic confrontationism. The pro-Moscow DKP, on the other hand, has preferred the company of the respectable liberals of the Citizens Initiative.

But of all the "far-left" groups, the one which has most brazenly sought to tail after the petty-bourgeois environmentalist movement while burying its own pretenses to communism is the Gruppe Internationale Marxisten (GIM, German section of the fake-Trotskyist United Secretariat). The GIM goes so far as to criticize the KBW for introducing any socialist politics at all, alleging that this "would simply exclude the many persons who do not yet oppose capitalism even though they oppose atomic power plants" (*Was Tun*, 9 December 1976).

Instead, the GIM proposes to build a "single-issue" campaign which, once it has won "tens of thousands" of adherents, will automatically unfold an "anti-capitalist dynamic"! Just as the "single-issue" "antiwar movement" led by the American SWP ended up building political support for the defeatist wing of the U.S. bourgeoisie, the GIM's hoped-for "mass movement" would at best merely build support for bourgeois environmentalists. More likely, in the more left-wing German political milieu, it will probably be self-defeating, leaving the field to the Maoists. ■

SPARTACIST LEAGUE FORUM

Spain: Powderkeg of Revolution

Speaker: SAM LEWIS
Workers Vanguard
Staff Writer
Spartacus Youth League
National Committee

Date: Saturday, 26 February

Time: 8:00 P.M.

Place: McBurney YMCA
215 West 23rd St.
(between 7th and 8th
Aves.)
Room 202

Donation \$1.00

For more information, call: 925-5665

NEW YORK

SL/SYL PUBLIC OFFICES

Marxist Literature

BAY AREA

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

CHICAGO

Tuesday 4:30-8:00 p.m.
Saturday 2:00-5:30 p.m.
650 South Clark 2nd floor
Chicago, Illinois
Phone 427-0003

NEW YORK

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

JUST OUT!

WOMEN AND REVOLUTION

Contents: No. 14

- Weather Underground Splits
- Supreme Court Wipes Out Gains for Women
- Murderous Sterilization Campaign in India
- International Women's Day Greeting of the Paris Action Committee, 1916
- Bottle or Breast? Poor children Still Die
- Trico Workers Win Equal Pay
- The Development of Soviet Educational Policies
- Victory to the Boston Preterm Strike!

SUBSCRIBE \$2/4 issues

Make checks payable/mail to:
SPARTACIST PUBLISHING CO..
Box 1377, GPO
New York, N.Y. 10001

International Women's Day Forums

CHICAGO Women's Liberation Through Proletarian Revolution

Speaker:
TWEET CARTER
Spartacist League Central
Committee

Saturday, March 5 at 7:30 p.m.
5615 S. Woodlawn
Phone: (312) 427-0003

CLEVELAND For Women's Liberation Through Socialist Revolution

Speaker:
RENA DREISER
Spartacist League

Tuesday, March 8 at 7:30 p.m.
KSU Student Center
Kent State U.
Phone: (216) 281-4781

DETROIT AND ANN ARBOR Women and Revolution, 1917-1977

Speaker:
KAY BLANCHARD
Women & Revolution Editorial
Board
Spartacist League

Wednesday, March 2 at 12:30 p.m.
Wayne State University
Hilberry C, SCB

Wednesday, March 2 at 7:30 p.m.
U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor
Assembly Hall, Michigan Union
Phone: (313) 869-1551

NEW YORK For Women's Liberation Through Socialist Revolution


Speaker:
ELIZABETH KENDALL
Spartacus Youth League National
Committee

Thursday, March 10 at 7:45 p.m.
Hamilton Hall, Rm. 703
Columbia U.
Phone: (212) 925-5665

WORKERS VANGUARD



Sit-down strikers at Fisher plant in Flint, Mich., on last day of strike, February 11, 1937, on strike calendar. Wayne State



Audience at Flint Memorial February 13. WV Photo

40 Years after Flint Strike: GM-UAW Tops Fete Labor Peace

From Sit-Down Strike to Sit-Down Dinner

DETROIT—Forty years ago last week, the victorious sit-down strikers of Flint, Michigan, marched out of the General Motors plants they had occupied for as long as 44 days. That strike, one of the high points of the American class struggle, was decisive in the founding of the United Auto Workers (UAW) and a crucial event in the building of the CIO. However, the official celebrations of the strike held recently in Detroit and Flint were not intended to revive the "spirit of '37" but rather to bury it.

In a disgusting display of class collaboration, UAW bureaucrats co-hosted a "Contract Anniversary Dinner" February 11 at the plush St. Regis

hotel in Detroit together with GM executives. Virtually indistinguishable from each other, corporation men and union leaders sipped cocktails, nibbled on shrimp and traded compliments on a first-name basis.

GM chairman Thomas Murphy took the opportunity to assert that "the days of class warfare in labor relations are over—as most of us sincerely hope, at any rate." General Motors vice president and chief negotiator George Morris, Jr. reflected that "the worst critics over the years have been those persons who not only would like to see constant conflict between management and unions but who also have advocated

the overthrow of our governmental system. I, for one, am willing to stand up and say 'who needs them?'" Morris, of course, was not referring to UAW president Leonard Woodcock or Irving Bluestone, the UAW's General Motors department head, whom he singled out as responsible union leaders.

The UAW leaders, who fully accept their role of disciplining the workforce and helping the companies rid themselves of militants, lauded the deceptive sweet-talk of corporation spokesmen. Commenting on the appropriateness of the dinner, Woodcock observed, "The dire consequences they [GM executives] predicted at the time [1937] have not

come true. I think this sort of thing could only happen in America, very frankly." To critics of the joint company-union banquet he answered simply that the UAW and GM split the expenses. According to Woodcock it is all right to wine and dine the bosses as long as union dues pay only half the bill.

The union's own memorial in Flint on February 13 was a lackluster affair—mainly an attempt on the part of today's UAW bureaucrats to anoint themselves as the legitimate heirs of 1937's heroic struggle. Two films and a play written for the occasion purported to place the sit-downs in the same tradition as Reuther's World War II no-strike pledge and his enrolling the union in massive construction of warplanes and tanks for the imperialists. The miserable 1976 contract was presented as a glorious fruit of the three-page document, won through bitter struggle in 1937, which granted the UAW a tenuous recognition.

While several hundred sit-downers and retirees attended the union's Sunday memorial, the virtual absence of younger auto workers was striking evidence of the vast gulf that separates today's union leadership from the rank and file. Many of the workers in the plants have never even heard of Flint 1937. For them, the banquet at St. Regis, with its homage to class collaboration, was par for the course.

The Reuthers and Woodcocks have done inestimable damage to the American labor movement. It will not be easy to revive the traditions of 1937, let alone to lead the working masses to genuine revolutionary consciousness. But the blows of the capitalists—the grinding speed-up, work intensification, the layoffs—will not go unanswered. It is not the tradition of class struggle, but the Reuthers, Woodcocks and Frasers who are outmoded and will be relegated to the graveyard of dinosaurs, together with their masters from the bourgeoisie. ■

Unionize J.P. Stevens!

The struggle to unionize the J.P. Stevens Company has an importance reaching far beyond even the desperate needs of the 44,000 workers employed by the company. A victory here will be a victory for the entire labor movement in the battle against runaway shops and a major step forward in organizing the masses of unorganized workers in the South.

In the past 25 years, this company, the second-largest textile manufacturer in the U.S., has closed down every one of its unionized Northern woolen mills to relocate in Georgia, North and South Carolina. There, workers earn wages 31 percent lower than the national average, noise conditions in the plants are intolerable, and thousands of workers suffer from byssinosis or "brown lung disease" because the dust levels in the plants are over three times that allowed by federal standards. Moreover, in the 13-year struggle, first by the United Textile Workers and now the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, the

company has had a notorious record of union busting—from firing union supporters to wiretapping phones of union organizers.

This is why the decision of the AFL-CIO to back up the ACTWU drive with a national campaign is so important. But tactics such as the planned consumer boycott or organizing hundreds of people to go into the stockholders meetings to publicize the struggle, can at best be only secondary. A large part of the company's textiles do not go directly to the consumer, but are transported by *union* labor to other manufacturers. While consumer boycotts sometimes take months to be even slightly effective, were the power of organized labor put behind the struggle through instituting the secondary boycott and refusing to handle the goods, the company would immediately be brought to its knees!

Victory to the organizing campaign! Hot-cargo all J.P. Stevens goods!