



Workers and soldiers march on Beja air base in southern Portugal protesting attempts to purge left-wing soldiers earlier this month.

Avante!

Soviets and the Struggle for Workers Power in Portugal...6

Crush Fascists in Portugal!

OCTOBER 20—Political turmoil and economic collapse, a breakdown of bourgeois authority and the absence of a revolutionary vanguard leading the workers forward to the seizure of power: this is the state of Portugal today. These are also the conditions which will drive tens of thousands of despairing petty bourgeois into the arms of Salazarist bishops, pro-NATO generals and ultra-rightist politicians backed by big business.

The world has already had a glimpse of what a victory by these forces would mean from the wave of burnings of Communist Party (CP) offices across northern Portugal in July and August. Unless the Portuguese working class can put a stop to the mounting chaos by energetic measures to crush bourgeois reaction, this terrorist onslaught will be a minor skirmish in comparison with the bloodbath which is even now being prepared. The drive to smash the soldiers committees, popular vigilance committees, workers and neighborhood commissions has as its end, not capitalist democracy, but naked reactionary dictatorship.

The Salazarist dictatorship in Portugal which lasted from 1926 to 1974 is often falsely referred to as fascist. But like the Franco dictatorship in Spain—and unlike Mussolini's Italy or Hitler's Germany—Salazar never had active mass support. The "New State" which put an end to the 1910 republic was a reactionary bonapartist regime whose social base of support was limited to the secret police and paramilitary forces, the Catholic church hierarchy, the army officer corps and a handful of powerful monopolists. However, today for the first time the beginnings of a genuine fascist movement are being seen in Portugal. The next March on Lisbon could look more like Mussolini's 1922 March on Rome.

The last week in Portugal continued to be dominated by fallout from the revolt of a military

transport unit (CICAP), triggered by an attempt of the army's northern regional commander, António Pires Veloso, to transfer (i.e., purge) several leftist soldiers and officers. At the high point, members of 18 different units in the northern region had gathered at the Porto artillery unit's barracks occupied by CICAP under the discipline of an elected "struggle committee." On October 14 the army chief of staff, General Carlos Fabião, negotiated with the rebels and offered a "compromise" which more than satisfied the unit, earlier dissolved by Pires Veloso. CICAP would be renamed the "April 25 Regiment," headed by a "revolutionary officer" and heavily armed.

Until now, Fabião had been considered one of the "moderate" Group of Nine leaders of the Armed Forces Movement (MFA) which has led the campaign for enforcing discipline in the barracks. But his deal with CICAP caused a storm in the Supreme Revolutionary Council, the leading body of the MFA, including calls for his resignation. Pires Veloso simply ignored his superior's negotiated settlement, authorizing unit commanders to hand out indefinite furloughs to anyone who had participated in the revolt.

The high command continues to worry about its strength relative to well-armed leftist units. Although the constitution of a Military Intervention Group (AMI) was decided upon in mid-September, only a single commando unit has joined it and it was forced to move its headquarters off the Montijo air base because of opposition from the troops. A 16 October UPI dispatch reported:

"Indicative of the decline in morale have been persistent leaks that if the crisis of authority becomes worse, the government might abandon Lisbon to the revolutionary left and let it be turned into a 'Lisbon Commune.'... 'Things move faster nowadays' [than at the time of the 1871 Paris Commune], a

continued on page 10

\$150 Million Pension Fund Giveaway

Shanker Bankrolls Big MAC Boondoggle

OCTOBER 19 Early last Friday the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) coughed up \$150 million from union pension funds to prevent New York from defaulting on its debt payments to the financial leeches who have bled the city dry. By his own admission, UFT president Albert Shanker caved in to "extortion" by the Emergency Financial Control Board (EFCB), the economic junta that now calls the shots on the city's budget. While major banks, private investors and the administrator of the state employees' pension fund, controller Arthur Levitt, wouldn't touch the latest long-term, "moral obligation" bonds issued by the Municipal Assistance Corporation (MAC), Shanker poured his members' retirement money down the MAC rat hole.

Shanker's meek protests are nothing but the bleating of a Judas goat after the slaughter. He scuttled a solid teachers strike and accepted the worst contract in UFT history only to have it vetoed by the EFCB as too expensive. Governor Hugh Carey, linchpin of the union-busting board, then salted the raw wound by arrogantly demanding that the union buy MAC bonds to bail out the city's "cash flow crisis." Shanker blustered a bit (UFT representatives on the pension fund's board twice voted against the purchase) and then responded with characteristic spinelessness.

While the city staggers under its financial burdens, President Gerald Ford and his spokesmen maintain their contemptuous hard-line austerity pitch designed to appeal to a puritanical "Middle America." Presidential press secretary Ron Nessen compared the city to "a wayward daughter hooked on heroin." Equally symptomatic was the refusal of Ford's aides to wake him to take a personal phone call from a frantic Mayor Beame pleading for assistance on the eve of an expected default.

But the country's top bankers, less concerned with Ford's pre-election image, are seriously pressing demands for either direct federal aid to NYC or at least federal backing for MAC's financially unappetizing bond issues. The heads of Chase Manhattan, First National City and the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company testified

continued on page 11

OCTOBER 18—Isabel Perón sneaked back to Buenos Aires Thursday night and in a hastily called ceremony reassumed the Argentine presidency. After a 33-day forced "vacation," the hapless former dancer found that virtually no one wanted to see her back in office. It was finally agreed that she could return long enough to preside over yesterday's "Loyalty Day" celebration, commemorating the 30th anniversary of the massive demonstrations and strikes which brought the release of then-imprisoned Colonel Juan Domingo Perón and propelled him to the presidency, which he held from 1946 to 1955 and again in 1973-74. But today even the leadership of the Peronist Justicialista movement is determined to see the *caudillo's* widow quickly bundled off to Spain, where her Rasputin, the hated butcher José Lopez Rega, is now living.

In fact, the only reason Isabel was even permitted to set foot in the Argentine capital again was the evident failure of her replacement, the Peronist former senator Italo Luder, to carry out his appointed tasks of "defending the institutional process" and "smashing the guerrillas." During August and September the audacity of leftist guerrillas reached the point where many military officers were talking of a coup simply for self-protection. On August 28 the Revolutionary People's Army (ERP) pulled off a dramatic operation by successfully blowing up a C130 Hercules transport plane (loaded with elite anti-guerrilla troops) during takeoff.

Despite Luder's talk of "national reconciliation," he was unable to do any better. In fact, his term in office was highlighted by the left-Peronist Montoneros' first attack on the army. In a flashy assault on the northern town of Formosa two weeks ago, the guerrillas failed to release their imprisoned comrades but nevertheless pulled off a well-coordinated getaway featuring the hijacking of several planes, including a Boeing 737. The military responded by forcing the government to create an internal security council in order to rubber-stamp whatever measures the high command deems necessary. A good idea of the mood in the upper echelons of the armed forces was given by a speech of General Jorge Olivera Rovere at a wake for an officer killed by leftist guerrillas in August:


"We shall be unable to face the verdict of history until ideological instigators, perjurers, traitors and assassins and their accomplices disappear forever.... A lot of blood may have to be spilled, but it will be the blood of the enemy and not a fruitless holocaust for our soldiers."

New York Times, 21 August

Last week General Luciano Menendez, known as a hard-liner, made clear that an army crackdown will not be directed solely at the guerrillas. "In order to be effective," he said, "repression must be carried out in all places where there is subversive action.... Measures will have to be taken in the trade unions, universities, etc." (*New York Times*, 13 October). And, in fact, it is among the organized workers that the greatest potential resistance to a military takeover lies. With inflation now exceeding a 300 percent annual rate and the sharp increase of unemployment during the last two months, labor is in a restive mood. The 100 percent wage increases exacted by the militant general strike in July have already been wiped out by skyrocketing prices. An indication of the mood in the unions was the remark that "I would rather have my throat cut by the guerrillas than by members of the Textile Workers Union" by that union's president, Casildo Herrerias.

But despite the increasing number of "Pinochetista" opinions being voiced among army officers, the Argentine military is by no means unanimous in desiring to take power. Having held power for 18 crisis-ridden years following their overthrow of Perón in 1955, the generals found they could not crush the massive popular resistance, restive working class and elusive guerrillas and finally turned the presidency over to the Peronist

Isabel Perón's Last Hurrah



Isabel Perón

Stern/Black Star

Hector Cámpora following the March 1973 elections. They are not eager to repeat this experience. Moreover, even the troops have begun to be "infected" with leftist ideas in the 90-percent draftee army. A 13 October DPA dispatch reports that "The refusal of the military authorities to use [conscript] soldiers in urban and rural search missions is well known."

The Failure of Peronism Without Perón

After the July 1974 death of Juan Domingo Perón, the bulk of the Argentine working class continued to view Peronism as its banner and hope. The myth of this "benefactor" of the *descamisados* (shirtless) derived from his sponsorship of mass unionization of the Argentine working class, the largest in Latin America, and the rise of workers' real wages during the late 1940's. That the unions were effectively controlled by the government's Labor Department and were set up to forestall the advance of socialist-led independent unions was at first not noticed by many workers. While Perón had already begun to crush important strikes during the early 1950's as the country's economic position worsened, he was replaced by the generals' even more repressive rule before the bankruptcy of his regime had become clear to the masses.

Bonapartist regimes, such as that of Perón, seek to act as arbiters balancing between antagonistic social classes while maintaining the domination of the ruling class. For this difficult task both a "heroic" figure and ample doses of demagogic rhetoric are needed, often combined with various populist schemes. Napoleon Bonaparte represented the consolidation of anti-Jacobin reaction in post-revolutionary France. He financed his international exploits by the imposition of burdensome salt and wine taxes on the impoverished masses. Nevertheless, in the hundred days' period after his escape from imprisonment on Saint Helena in 1815, the "left" Bonaparte sought to forge an army by rallying around him the plebeian and peasant masses with promises to relieve them of the oppressive taxes.

When Perón returned to Argentina in 1973 we warned that "...the current Peronist regime will be a government of reaction - an instrument to carry out the job the military has been unable to do, namely to put an end to the workers' militancy which has been raging through the country since 1969" (*WV* No. 24, 6 July 1973). And so it was, as his regime and that of his widow adopted viciously anti-labor policies. But this was not immediately clear to Argentine workers

for, like Napoleon Bonaparte in 1815, Perón had made liberal use of leftist rhetoric during the last years of his exile, at one point even stating that he would be a guerrilla today if he were younger. Again like Bonaparte, he died before the Peronist myth had been shattered.

Although they cannot displace the fundamental class forces which determine the course of history, myths are not without importance at certain junctures. Thus after being freed of the oppressive and incompetent "constitutional monarchy" in 1848—and after the brutal crushing of the Paris proletariat in the June Days—the French population voted overwhelmingly for Bonaparte's questionable nephew, Louis Napoleon, in a reaction against the bourgeois terror. Just as Louis was merely a farce of his uncle, so Isabel is only a caricature of the *caudillo*. Despite her constant calls on the workers to be true to her late husband, the strikes became more frequent, more general and more militant. Peronism without Perón—bonapartism without the Bonaparte—has been a failure for the bourgeoisie.

The Struggle for Working-Class Independence

Though the Peronist myth is by now badly tarnished, it has not been shattered. For this it is necessary not only to expose the bankruptcy of a particular individual but to carry on a tenacious struggle to break the Argentine working class from all sectors of the bourgeoisie, including that sector represented by Peronist populism. And it is this task which the reformist, social-democratic Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST—Socialist Workers Party, Argentine sympathizing organization of the United Secretariat) has consistently failed to undertake.

Already in the 1950's Nahuel Moreno (today one of the main PST leaders) began his decades-long capitulation to Peronism. For years he published *Palabra Obrera*, which described itself as being "under the direction of General Perón." In late 1972 the PST offered to vote Justicialista—i.e., for what even it termed a bourgeois party!—provided 80 percent of the candidates on the Peronist slate were workers. And after Cámpora took office in May 1973, PST leader Juan Carlos Coral offered the new president "our proletarian solidarity." Last year these fake Trotskyists pledged to Perón their support for "the institutional process" (i.e., bourgeois law-and-order), and then promised his widow to "fight for the continuity" of her government!

But now Isabel is not so popular with the workers, so PST calls for "the resignation of Madame President with

the objective that Parliament put into functioning the established legal mechanisms, convoking a Constituent Assembly, which... had been repeatedly promised by General Perón himself" (*Avanzada Socialista*, 8 August). What of the working class, the union bureaucrats, political independence of labor? The PST says only that "within this dramatic institutional process the workers movement should exercise a protagonist's role." It adds that the "CGT [labor federation] should impose its plan and... put it into practice by taking power in its hands." Yet nowhere does the PST call on the unions to break from Peronism. As for the CGT plan, even *Avanzada Socialista* calls it a "plan of class collaboration" which does not call for "expropriating the oligarchy and imperialism." Thus once again, rather than seeking to break the Peronists' stranglehold on the working class, instead of putting forward a perspective of workers power, the reformist PST proposes merely to *pressure* the pro-capitalist labor bureaucracy to implement its own class-collaborationist policies. ■

CORRECTIONS

WV No. 77 stated that Cook County Sheriff Richard Elrod "achieved notoriety for taking a flying leap at a demonstrator outside the 1968 Democratic Party Convention." In fact, the incident occurred 11 October 1969, when Elrod tackled Brian Flanagan during the Weatherman "Days of Rage" demonstration.

The subscription drive report published in *WV* No. 80 inadvertently reversed the figures for the San Francisco and East Bay branches.

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: Liz Gordon (Chairman), Chris Knox (Labor), James Robertson (Advisory), Charles Burroughs (Editorial Staff), Joseph Seymour (Midwest), George Foster (West Coast)

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. Application to mail at second class postage rates is pending at New York, N.Y.

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

"White Power" March Stopped

Chicago Rally Against Nazi Provocation

CHICAGO—An important united-front rally of black and socialist organizations was held here Sunday, October 12, to counter attempts by the National Socialist White People's Party to spread its race-hate poison with a provocative "White Power" march into the black community bordering Marquette Park on Chicago's southwest side.

The anti-fascist rally at 71st and Damen, directly in the line of march, drew over 100 people and kept up militant picketing and chanting for over three hours, not disbanding until it was clear that the Nazi scum would *not* enter the black neighborhood. Organizations participating in the united front included the Concerned Black Fathers of America (whose national president, Rev. Edward Sparks, chaired the rally) as well as the Communist Labor Party, the Committee to Stop the Klan, the Revolutionary Socialist League, the International Socialists and the Spartacist League Spartacist Youth League (SL/SYL).

The fascists had started off with a rally at Marquette Park, which reportedly drew about 1,000 persons. (In last April's city elections the Nazis put up four

class. He linked the struggle in Chicago to the need for labor/black defense of busing against racist attacks like those in Boston and Louisville, and pointed to the successful campaign initiated by the Labor Struggle Caucus of UAW Local 6 near Chicago, which prevented a black worker's home from being destroyed by racists.

In an almost incredible display of sectarianism, the Progressive Labor Party (PL) held a *separate* rally across the street from the main rally. Their chants of "Workers Unite!" had a hollow ring given this despicable separatism. The main rally replied, "Smash the Nazis, Smash the Klan -PL Join Us, Take a Stand!" and "Don't be splitters, Don't be fools—Division is the bosses' tool!" The October League also reportedly held a small rally at 63rd and Ashland, safely away from the main action. Finally, two hesitant reporters of the SWP's *Militant* appeared briefly to peer at the rally from across the street. Since the Socialist Workers Party believes in the right of "free speech for fascists," it is not surprising that they failed to participate.

The SL's insistence that cops and



Militant anti-Nazi demonstrators protest "White Power" march in Chicago, October 12.

candidates for alderman in this area, winning 16 percent of the vote in one ward.) Following appeals to "save the white race" a small number of uniformed adult Nazis began the march accompanied by a crowd of undisciplined youths, many wearing "White Power" T-shirts. However, police headed off the march to prevent a possible violent confrontation between the two demonstrations before the fascists could enter the black community. Nazi leader Frank Collin and some 30 of his supporters were arrested.

The anti-Nazi rally, despite its small numbers, was nevertheless an important step in developing a strong and united labor/black defense against the terrorist fascist bands. A Spartacist speaker emphasized that the fascists can be stopped only by mobilizing the working

courts cannot be relied upon to stop fascism was amply borne out by the fact that the American Civil Liberties Union obtained a parade permit for the Nazis, allowing them to enter the black neighborhood. Presumably the SWP supports this action, since it opposes "anti-democratic" demonstrations to prevent the fascists from spewing out their murderous filth.

Our insistence that the Nazis don't just have "bad ideas" but are *racist terrorists* was dramatically proven by the fascists' violence at their rallying point, where they stoned black people on the street and the home of a black family on the borderline between the white and black neighborhoods. Frank Haley, a black resident who was attacked, fired a gun into the air to chase away the racist



hooligans, whereupon he was promptly arrested by the police and charged with failure to register a weapon!

Willie Curtis, executive director of the West Englewood Community Organization, a small black nationalist group, also showed up to actively oppose the anti-fascist rally, claiming that "any group of people have the right to demonstrate peacefully" and asking "why react to these filthy scums?" This is the worst kind of Martin Luther King style, pacifist, "If-there's-any-blood-spilled-let-it-be-our-blood" defeatism. The Nazis are vicious and armed thugs who will burn, beat and lynch black people any time they get the chance. Decaying capitalism provides a fertile breeding ground for fascist terror, which must be rooted out and destroyed before it can take hold! Only the strongest possible militant self-defense organization of workers and blacks can be relied on to stop these attacks!

Although clearly much stronger defense efforts will be necessary in the future to counter the fascist provocations, Sunday's rally marked an important step for the Chicago left. It was probably the first time that the various organizations participating had been in a genuine united front with each other, and was a vindication of the Spartacist League's long-standing position on the necessity of such united-front action against racist and anti-working-class terrorism. This promising first step must be followed by further attempts to organize united defense against the fascists, and to teach these cowardly bullies some well-deserved lessons about the power of a militant working class. ■

SL/SYL PUBLIC OFFICES

Revolutionary Literature

BAY AREA

Friday and Saturday } 3:00-6:00 p.m.

330-40th Street
(near Broadway)
Oakland, California
Phone 653-4668

CHICAGO

Tuesday 4:00-8:00 p.m.
Saturday 2:00-6:00 p.m.

650 South Clark
Second floor
Chicago, Illinois
Phone 427-0003

NEW YORK

Monday through Friday } 6:30-9:00 p.m.

Saturday 1:00-4:00 p.m.

260 West Broadway
Room 522
New York, New York
Phone 925-5665

I.S. "Impressive Demos" Fizzle

OCTOBER 18—A series of dispirited demonstrations today, centering on the slogan "Portugal Must Not Become Another Chile," marked the end of the first month of the International Socialists' "worker membership campaign." The demonstrations were part of a futile attempt by the IS to capitalize on publicity recently afforded its favored group in Portugal, the Proletarian Revolutionary Party (PRP), which last week received write-ups in both the *New York Times* and *Time* magazine. The PRP is most notable for its political flirtation with the wing of the ruling Armed Forces Movement (MFA) led by the strikebreaking General Otelo Saraiva de Carvalho, head of the COPCON strike force.

In the demonstrations, the IS gave top billing to the slogan "Support the United Revolutionary Front" (FUR). This popular-frontist coalition originated with an August 25 communiqué supporting the now-deposed Gonçalves government, and endorsing the COPCON document (which IS national chairman Joel Geier claims was written by Carvalho's PRP braintrustees) calling for "strengthening discipline" in the military and "the genuine achievement of the MFA-People Alliance." In a leaflet distributed at the New York rally, the Spartacist League scored the IS' oblivious disdain for communist principles:

"Never mind that the New Left-syndicalist PRP explicitly rejects the basic Leninist conception of the need for a vanguard party—the PRP calls for 'unity of the proletariat, independent of political groups and parties' (*Revolução*, 8 June 1974). Never mind that the PRP openly discards the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks—PRP leader Isabel do Carmo: 'There are no models. For the first time in the world we are working out a real socialist revolution. The Soviets couldn't do it...' (*New York Times*, 14 October 1975). And never mind that the PRP plunged itself head first into the class-collaborationist United Revolutionary Front (FUR)..."

With a deeply ingrained tailist appetite, the IS endorses a program which opens the door to a Chilean solution to the Portuguese crisis.

But opportunism doesn't pay—in this case, not even in the short run. The New York demonstration drew not quite 30 listless participants, including components of the "Portugal Solidarity Committee," a motley propaganda bloc whose slogans, directed largely against CIA NATO intervention in Portugal and Angola, simply avoid the crucial questions before the Portuguese masses. Disgruntlement prefiguring a short and sorry career for this minuscule conglomeration was evident when the Revolutionary Socialist League declined to mobilize for the event allegedly on account of rain (!), abandoning its partners of the International Workers Party and Trotskyist Organizing Committee.

In the Bay Area, about 125 demonstrators marched while the IS chanted slogans supporting the FUR, having explained in a planning meeting that the FUR wasn't really class-collaborationist because the Communist Party had departed from it! These Stalinophobes breathe a sigh of relief at distance from the reformist CP, while not flinching at endorsement of the capitalist MFA, the officer corps of the bourgeois army!

But going from bad to worse, in Detroit, its national headquarters, IS failed to even draw its own membership. IS supporters took *no* part in their own demonstration and its tiny contingent was seen leaving the area at the time slated for the demonstration to begin. Perhaps the rain dampened their enthusiasm. After all—when General Carvalho can be relied on to make the revolution, why bother to get wet?

Sakharov Gets Imperialist "Peace" Prize

OCTOBER 20—The award of the Nobel "Peace" Prize, established by the inventor of dynamite, to Andrei Sakharov, "father of the Soviet H bomb," is not inappropriate. Both Sakharov and Alfred Nobel repented their contributions to the technology of warfare and began to preach bourgeois liberal sentimentality about world peace. Such hypocrites dream wistfully of a harmonious order in which the imperialist predators can "peacefully" feed on their spoils. Sakharov joins a less than admirable coterie of imperialist "statesmen" including the likes of Henry Kissinger, awarded the prize in 1973 for his efforts to impose a robbers' peace on the workers and peasants of Vietnam.

Although a small fry in such company, Sakharov deserves a certain tawdry fame as Henry Jackson's ideological fifth columnist in the USSR. Opposing unconditional détente on the grounds that "Western reconciliation with Moscow on Soviet terms posed a serious threat to the world," he supported Jackson's Congressional amendment which demanded free

emigration from the Soviet Union as a precondition for improved trade relations.

Sakharov also admires American capitalism as a "much healthier" system superior to the "militarized and chaotically managed" planned economy created by the Russian Revolution. He advocates a technological boycott of Russia by the imperialist countries, arguing that "... large amounts of Western technological aid... would help the Russians get rid of economic problems they cannot solve on their own and would enable them to concentrate on accumulating strength. As a result... the world would become helpless before this uncontrollable bureaucratic machine." He piously advises U.S. imperialism, just emerging from a bloody imperialist war, that "no one should ever be expected to live next to such a neighbor [the USSR], especially one who is armed to the teeth" (*New York Times*, 22 August 1973).

The Gunpowder Peace Prize went to Sakharov precisely because he champions "human rights" by appealing to the

blood-stained imperialist warmongers to isolate and pressure the Soviet Union. Other "Soviet dissidents" like historian Roy Medvedev and General Pyotr Grigorenko, who still consider themselves Marxist-Leninists and defend the heritage of the October Revolution, are far less appealing to the Nobel committee.

In 1973 Sakharov was reportedly considered for the award but passed over in favor of Dr. "Strangelove" Kissinger. Among his backers at the time was Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, who today advocates tsarism, Russian Orthodox religious obscurantism and the launching of World War III, while banking his royalties in Switzerland.

Formerly a distinguished Soviet scientist decorated for wartime bravery, Sakharov's now openly pro-imperialist views have evolved over several decades. In the late 1950's he personally interceded with Khrushchev in favor of a unilateral Russian ban on nuclear testing. He became known in the West when his "Thoughts on Progress, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom" was published



Andrei Sakharov

abroad in 1968. At that time he was promoting détente and the theory of "convergence" between capitalism and socialism. Today he believes that the USSR is a state-capitalist society, distinguished from the U.S. primarily by its "totalitarian" structure. On that basis he sentimentalizes over the "democracy" of Gerald Ford and Henry Jackson.

Even in his muddleheaded defense of abstract democracy, Sakharov is less than consistent. In September 1973 he co-authored a letter to the Chilean junta pleading for the life of Pablo Neruda because "The loss of this great man would becloud for a long time the epoch of rebirth and consolidation proclaimed by your Government." In a telephone interview with a Western reporter, this "champion" of human rights "declined to take a stand for or against the junta on the ground that 'Chile is too far away.'" Later he explained that he didn't want to join the Russian "chorus" of denunciations of the butcher Pinochet (*New York Times*, 26 September 1973).

Sakharov's anti-communism is not the product of mental illness or Yankee gold, as the Stalinist rulers of the USSR would have Russian workers believe. His petty-bourgeois utopian views are a reaction to the stifling intellectual and political repression wielded by the Soviet bureaucracy to protect its power. In certain respects his reliance on pressure by the imperialist powers is little more than a logical extension of the bureaucracy's own "peaceful coexistence" policies. By seeking to stave off both revolution and counterrevolution through compromise with imperialism, it is the Stalinist usurpers, far more than socially impotent critics like the Westernizer Sakharov or the Slavophile Solzhenitsyn, who pose the real internal danger to the preservation of the social and economic conquests of the 1917 revolution.

When the Soviet proletariat frees itself from the shackles of bureaucratic rule and reconquers political power through political revolution, Sakharov may ironically receive favorable mention in their history books. He will be noted not for his Nobel Peace Prize, nor for toadying to Henry Jackson but for his distinguished role in developing a hydrogen bomb for the USSR. Constituting one of the main deterrents to John Foster Dulles' dreams of "rolling back" Russian power in Eastern Europe, this achievement was a far greater contribution to world peace than those of all the recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize combined. ■

Teach-in On Chile:

sponsored by the Committee against Friedman-Harberger Collaboration with the Chilean Junta

Sunday, October 26, 2:30-6:00 p.m.
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
Quantrell Auditorium
Cobb Hall, 5811 South Ellis

To be followed by a panel discussion and slide show on Chile.

German Centrists Call for Stopping Revolution in Portugal

At its Fifth National Conference held late last summer, the German centrist Spartacusbund (SpB) appeared to be making a significant left turn. At least, it might have been significant if only one could take the SpB's proclamations seriously as reflecting real policies. But the printers' ink of the fine phrases of its major conference resolution was hardly dry on the paper when the SpB ran afoul of the harsh reality of the class struggle as posed in Portugal. In a matter of weeks, the SpB vacated its leftist posture to demonstrate again that its incessant zigzags to the left and right are little more than cynical attempts to find a programmatic facade aimed either at papering over the internecine power squabbles of the SpB's inveterately warring internal cliques, or at forming some rotten bloc with tired centrists which it can pass off as proof of its "internationalism."

The conference resolution (published in *Spartacus* No. 19, August 1975) abounded with specific and far-reaching left criticisms of the SpB's past political line and explicitly generalized them as "characterizing the centrist line of our organization." The resolution also conceded that the split of the rightist "Bolshevik Tendency" in May 1975 had raised the general question: how to explain why all the tendencies which had split from the Spartacusbund and its predecessors—with the exception of those which fused with the German section of the international Spartacist tendency—were "right splits which broke fundamentally with the program of Trotskyism."

For an organization to label its past thrust as centrist should signal a real internal struggle for rectification. Yet within weeks of the appearance of the resolution in the SpB press, the Spartacusbund central committee adopted a document, "The Portuguese Revolution in Danger" (23 August 1975), published

in a pamphlet of the same name along with a long tendency document on Portugal by three SpB leaders on which the resolution was based. Formally at least, these materials appeared to mark a sharp *rightward* shift from the SpB's previous line!

The SpB abandoned (at least temporarily) a somewhat left version of the United Secretariat (Usec) majority line (uncritically supporting the workers commissions as presently constituted and orienting mainly to the Communist Party) in favor of a position whose logical conclusion points to the position of the Usec minority led by the U.S. Socialist Workers Party (SWP). The SpB August resolution credited the Portuguese Socialist Party with incorporating the desire of the broad masses of workers for socialism, and the tendency document states "the central tactical task is to 'normalize' the revolution; the tactical levers are the Constituent Assembly and, at a later point in time, the slogan of a workers government." The term "normalization" has a special significance, since it has traditionally been applied within the Trotskyist movement to describe the Stalinist apparatus' suppression of strikes and uprisings in Eastern Europe.

The SpB central committee wants to keep the advanced workers "from plunging thoughtlessly forward"! The pamphlet constitutes nothing less than a call to *stop the revolution* in Portugal and return to the "most radical democratic demands," which are to be posed to the Constituent Assembly.

To justify this retreat, the SpB takes cover behind the observation that the Portuguese working class is deeply divided and lacks a revolutionary organization which "can directly pose the task of the immediate seizure of power." One cannot but recall the Marcy faction of the SWP, which justified its support to the suppression of the 1956 Hungarian

revolution by the ingenious explanation that without a Trotskyist vanguard party, the Hungarian workers' uprising could not succeed in overturning the bureaucracy and thus only opened the door to CIA manipulation and capitalist restoration. The Marcyites drew the "logical" conclusion of supporting the brutal suppression of the Hungarian workers by Russian tanks as the only practical way to restore order. The SpB's impulse is the same: under cover of a defeatist analysis, it lines up behind the Socialist Party and "democratic demands."

This latest oscillation of leftist zig and rightist zag failed in its attempt to impose an uneasy truce upon the cliques which make up the unstable SpB, since *Spartacus* No. 20, which appeared a few weeks after the new position, and at about the same time that the pamphlet was published, carried a line on Portugal *counterposed* to the central committee resolution. As practitioners of Menshevik "freedom of criticism," the SpB sees nothing amiss in opening the flood gates of bitter debate in the pages of its public press, with the two main wings accusing one another of crypto-Stalinism and of Menshevism. A note appended to the lead article in *Spartacus* No. 21 (September 1975) states that "at its September meeting the Central Committee will come to a decision on a position on Portugal binding for the whole organization which will also put the Spartacusbund in a position of being able, firm and united, to advance its revolutionary perspective...."

But most likely the Portugal debate is but the prelude to another right split as the SpB lurches from pillar to post in a futile effort to achieve internal peace. One SpB leader's declaration (in the Portugal pamphlet) that "politics is not made at the level of principles" sums up the only unity this centrist swamp can ever achieve and testifies to the fundamental political bankruptcy of the Spartacusbund. ■

Larry Wing Ousted

Bridges Strongarms ILWU Local 10

SAN FRANCISCO, October 17—The increasingly frantic attacks of the Pacific Maritime Association (PMA) on West Coast longshoremen's jobs and incomes are reaching a fever pitch. The employers have drastically cut the weekly wage supplement of the Pay Guarantee Plan (PGP) and launched a wholesale attack on jobs, cutting the gangs and men on the night dock board and demanding the elimination of the day and night shift general dock board, the dock exemption board and car board. The purpose of the elimination of these classifications (by which longshoremen are assigned work through the union hiring hall) is to flood the remaining boards with an oversupply of workers, paving the way for their deregistration and layoff. Rumors abound that up to 1,000 men may soon be sacked.

The employers' offensive has been fueled by the do-nothing policies of International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) president Harry Bridges. Prepared to watch over the progressive destruction of the union, Bridges has focused his attention on purging dissident San Francisco longshore Local 10 president Larry Wing and, at all costs, preventing strikes. Thus the October 16 membership meeting saw Bridges supporters railroad Wing out of office and prevent a crucial Local 10 executive board motion mandating strike action from reaching the floor for

motion and emphasizing the need for united action against PMA.

Bureaucratic Manipulation

But, as we predicted in the last issue of *WV*, the Bridges forces tried (unfortunately successfully) to take up the entire October 16 membership meeting with the continuing intrabureaucratic war between Bridges and Wing backers, to the exclusion of considering united strike action vital to secure all longshoremen's jobs. Repeated attempts by the supporters of the strike motion to put it on the floor at the beginning of the meeting were ruled out of order by a highhanded chair, although about a quarter of the longshoremen present voted to overrule this decision.

The struggle between Wing and Bridges which has paralyzed the Local for several months appears to be coming to a close as Wing suffers defeat after defeat. The latest episode in this strife began when Wing refused to raid the Sailors Union of the Pacific (SUP) in the face of a pro-raiding motion by the Local 10 executive board, backed by the Bridges camp. The local secretary-treasurer Carl Smith, longtime Bridges hack, circulated a petition to suspend Wing on the vague grounds of "misfeasance and malfeasance." Wing replied with a court suit and a petition to suspend Smith.

At the October Local meeting the

uproar from the floor. Demands for a division of the house were heard on all sides, and many believed Wing could have won such a division by a few votes.

But eager to prevent a revote and to curtail the agenda before consideration of the strike-for-jobs motion, Bridges supporters apparently provoked a fight, which spread quickly through the hall. The chairman announced that Wing was constitutionally entitled to demand a referendum and quickly declared the meeting adjourned.

The history of the explosive San Francisco longshore local, which Bridges has long been trying to get under control, indicates that referendum ballots are if anything more subject to International tampering than union meetings. In any event, the Local 10 constitution prevents anyone from serving as a full-time paid union official for more than two years. Wing, who was a full-time business agent for a year prior to being elected president, will be ineligible to run again in the upcoming local elections.

The Rise and Demise of Larry Wing

Larry Wing's fate is part and parcel of the International's drive to eliminate all opposition to the maritime magnates' profit-boosting campaign, which Bridges heartily upholds. But to ILWU militants, Wing's career should also serve as

sive programmatic opposition to Bridges at the last International convention, Wing fought only on the correct but minor democratic point that Bridges and ILWU International vice president Bill Chester had no right to be automatically seated as voting delegates from Local 10. Wing lost. Following the convention, he ran for International Executive Board member, and lost again.

In the bitter and unsuccessful fight by longshoremen to reject Bridges' 1975 contract proposal—which paved the way for the current PMA attacks—Wing never once called for strike action, and could only complain that the contract's three-year duration was too long. By stating that he would vote for the same offer if it were only for two years, Wing bears responsibility for today's results.

Wing's refusal to have any part of the ILWU raiding on the SUP showed that there were trade-union principles that he was not prepared to abandon. But lacking opposition to the capitalist class and its union-busting courts, Wing then proceeded to defend what had been a decent impulse by an act of class treason: dragging the ILWU's internal affairs into the capitalist courts for resolution.

Such is the record of a militant, but reformist, oppositionist.

In refusing to support Wing in the last election, the *Longshore Militant* pointed out that without a program of irreconcilable class struggle, even militant opponents of Bridges could only fail the union. A real opposition to Bridges can be built and made effective only on a program such as has been put forth over the last year by the *Longshore Militant* and its supporters. Without consistent opposition to the employers, their government and their agents in the workers movement (the union bureaucracy), and a positive perspective for a workers government to wrench loose capitalism's stranglehold, oppositionists in the ILWU can only end up discredited and politically impotent. This lesson for labor has been clearly proven by the experience of Larry Wing. ■



SUP picketers halting scabs at Pacific Far East Lines last July.

Joseph J. Rosenthal

membership ratification.

The executive board motion passed October 9 in response to the stepped-up attacks on PGP and the boards stated:

"1. Turn down the PMA's demands on the board. Refuse to negotiate and take the issue to the membership.

"2. ILWU Local 10 opposes all the cutbacks and divisions made by PMA and the arbitrator on boards, gangs and the PGP. We demand full PGP for all members including the dock exemption board and callback rights for B-men. We demand jobs for all longshoremen by a sliding scale of hours with no loss in pay whereby all available work is divided among all members. The local will take strike action to enforce these demands and calls on other ports to join us in solidarity.

"3. To open up miscellaneous categories and all steady categories to disabled longshoremen."

The initiators of the crucial second part of the motion were executive board members Stan Gow and Howard Keylor, well-known Local 10 militants and editors of the oppositional *Longshore Militant*. Seven longshoremen, including Gow and Keylor, signed and distributed an October 13 leaflet promoting the

reports of both trial committees were heard and put up for the constitutionally required ratification of the membership. The membership upheld the trial committee's verdict of innocent for Smith. The Wing trial committee had reported a guilty verdict by a 5-to-3 vote. This clearly unjust decision in effect supported raiding and strikebreaking, whereas Wing should have been vindicated.

Wing, however, had dissipated much of the support he originally had by seeking a court injunction to block Smith's charges against him. Though his case was quickly thrown out (the capitalist judiciary having no interest in bolstering workers solidarity), longshoremen, who know from painful experience that bringing the bosses' courts into union affairs attacks the independence of the ILWU, recoiled from Wing's defense.

Longshoremen at Thursday's membership meeting told a *WV* reporter that the vote on accepting the trial committee's decision to remove Wing from office was extremely close. The chairman announced the verdict sustained, which caused a tremendous

damning testimony to the narrow limits and futility of simple trade unionism. Wing's "good intentions" and a certain gut-level liking for a fight simply could not shape up a real alternative to the vile and vindictive Bridges regime.

Wing was suddenly catapulted from a business agent to the office of Local president by his courage in physically resisting a goon-squad attack by Bridges supporters upon the officers of Local 10 at a time when the International was trying to engineer the sale of the union hall. As Local president one of his first acts was to call a work stoppage in solidarity with the action of the Stockton longshore local in an attempt to preserve its jurisdiction on Pacific Far East Lines' LASH barge work. But mired in a reformism incapable of mobilizing the ranks for a confrontation with the government, Wing called off the Local 10 refusal to handle barges loaded by non-ILWU labor under pressure of heavy court fines. Angry longshoremen shouted at Wing that he had just given away their jobs.

Incapable of formulating a comprehen-

YOUNG SPARTACUS

Current Issue—

- Milton Friedman and "Chicago Boys" Implicated in Chilean Repression: Protest Barbaric Junta's Collaborators!
- Pat Swinton Acquitted: Abolish All Conspiracy Laws!
- SWP/YSA Pushes "New Civil Rights Movement": Ex-Trotskyists Tail Uncle Toms
- Banker Barons Slam New York City
- Portuguese Workers Must Take Power!

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

\$2/11 issues

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State/Zip _____

82

Make payable/mail to:
Spartacus Youth Publishing Co.
Box 825, Canal Street P.O.
New York, New York 10013

Soviets and the Struggle for Workers Power in Portugal

In the course of every revolutionary struggle there arises an urgent objective need to unite the forces of the proletariat (along with its allies among other exploited, impoverished and specially oppressed sectors of the population) to wage effective battle against the class enemy. This requires not only combining the forces of existing organizations of the workers movement—which even in their totality seldom encompass a majority of the class—but also forging new organs capable of rousing to struggle the more backward elements of the masses. In the Russian Revolution of 1917 this need was

Part 1 of 2


fulfilled above all by the *soviets*, or councils, of workers, soldiers and peasants. Under the leadership of the Bolshevik party, these councils were transformed from a *dual power*, counterposed to the bourgeois state apparatus, into the organizational framework of a revolutionary *workers and peasants government*.

The need for what Leon Trotsky called “the highest form of the united front under the conditions in which the proletariat enters the epoch of fighting for power” (“What Next?” January 1932) is urgently felt in Portugal today as the country teeters on the brink of civil war. While the popular-front government moves to restore discipline in the ranks of the armed forces by purging leftists and forming a new counterrevolutionary strike force—and as ultra-rightist and openly fascist forces are gearing up for a new wave of anti-working-class terror far greater in scope than that of last summer—the workers movement has no organ for united counterattack against the rightist offensive.

The sharp divisions in the Portuguese workers movement are present at every level. In the unions the Communist Party (CP) has a strong base among metal workers and agricultural workers, while an alliance between the Socialist Party (SP) and Maoist currents dominates the white-collar unions (bank workers, office workers). Among the numerous workers commissions, neighborhood commissions, popular vigilance committees, etc., the fragmentation is even more extreme. This can be shown by looking at several conferences and demonstrations over the last two months:

On September 27-28 the “First National Congress of Workers Commissions” was held in the textile town of Covilhã. Despite weeks of preparation only 43 enterprises sent mandated delegates. Most of the left parties boycotted the meeting, alleging that it was dominated by the hard-Maoist Movement for the Reorganization of the Proletarian Party (MRPP). The “National Secretariat of Workers Commissions” elected at the congress includes representatives of TAP airlines, the Timex watch factory, TLP (Lisbon telephones), Efacec and OGMA (air force supplies depot).

Ten days earlier a “rigidly non-party”



Workers strike at Lisnave shipyards.

Informations Ouvrières

“In order to enter the broad road, the proletariat needs even now an organization rising over all the present political, national, provincial, and trade union divisions in their ranks and corresponding to the sweep of the present revolutionary struggle. Such an organization, democratically elected by the workers of the factories, mills, mines, commercial enterprises, railway and marine transport, by the proletarians of the city and village, can only be the soviet. The epigones have done immeasurable damage to the revolutionary movement of the whole world, fixing in many minds the prejudice that soviets can only be created by the needs of an armed insurrection and only on the brink of this insurrection. In reality, the soviets are created when the revolutionary movement of the working masses, even though still far from an armed insurrection, creates the need for a broad, authoritative organization, capable of leading the economic and political struggle embracing simultaneously the different enterprises and the different trades.”

—L. D. Trotsky, “The Revolution in Spain,” January 1931

demonstration was called by a coordinating committee of workers commissions of the greater Lisbon industrial belt, drawing approximately 50,000 participants. With its demand for ousting the bourgeois Popular Democrats (PPD) from the government and judging from the list of 40 endorsing workers commissions, observers concluded that the real organizer of the demonstration was the Communist Party. Among the sponsors were commissions of COPAM, Carris bus company, EPAL (Lisbon water works), a coordinating committee of workers commissions of the former CUF trust, and the Alfeite arsenal.

On August 2-3 another national congress was held, of the “Revolutionary Workers, Soldiers and Sailors Councils” (CRTSM), attended by delegates from approximately 50 enterprises—among them Sacor, Lisnave and Setenave shipyards, the Siderurgia Nacional steel plant, Standard Eléctrica and Rádio Renascença—and almost 20 military units. In spite of the imposing name,

however, the CRTSM actually amount to front groups for the New Left-sindicalist Proletarian Revolutionary Party (PRP), and range in size from a handful of members to several hundred. This conference, also, was boycotted by virtually all other left organizations.

Thus there are at least three competing coalitions of what purport to be “organs of people’s power,” each representing more than 40 enterprises and each with its own access to arms. *None* is sufficiently broad to serve as the organizing center for proletarian revolution. The need for a unitary national soviet could not be clearer.

Why Soviets?

Yet in Portugal today virtually no one is calling for soviets! Instead there is much talk of “organs of people’s power” and “popular assemblies.” The terminology is clearly Stalinist, corresponding to the reformist concept of a “two-stage” revolution in which the first stage is not

proletarian revolution but some variety of multi-class “people’s revolution.” The concepts themselves gained currency in Lisbon after the assembly of the ruling Armed Forces Movement (MFA) adopted a “guide document” entitled the “MFA-People Alliance” last July 8. The document states: “The defense and energizing of the Revolution... requires... a) encourage the revolutionary participation of the masses by creating and developing unified groups, in order to create true organs of popular power...”

The “guide document” was immediately hailed by virtually all of the non-Maoist “far left.” The International Communist League (LCI, Portuguese sympathizing organization of the United Secretariat), which claims to be Trotskyist, issued a leaflet stating that pressure from the workers had “obliged the MFA to recognize these structures as the organized expressions of the workers” (quoted in *Intercontinental Press*, 4 August). Its mentors in Paris agreed; the 18 July *Rouge*, newspaper of the Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire (LCR), concluded: “The ‘guide document’ incorporates and thereby encourages the development of the self-organization of the workers.” Almost as an afterthought, *Rouge* adds, “But it also seeks to structure it.”

Not “structuring” but *control* is what the MFA plan aimed at. It hoped to create an illusion of “transferring power to the working class” while keeping these organs firmly subordinated to the bourgeois state, establishing a corporatist structure which can serve as a transmission belt for MFA policies. The local popular assemblies are to be formed by workers commissions, tenants commissions and other rank-and-file organizations which “after study” the MFA “will

continued on page 9

Roy Medvedev on Soviet Dissidents

by D. Chembar

The most important development in Soviet political life during the first half of the 1970's was the resolution into its contradictory components of the so-called "dissident movement," a conglomeration of disparate elements held together by mutual awareness of their vulnerability to brutal suppression at the hands of the Soviet bureaucratic ruling elite. The death of this basically petty-bourgeois "movement" was perhaps best

REVIEW: *On Socialist Democracy* by Roy Medvedev

symbolized by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's appearance in Washington as the fanatically anti-communist prophet of World War III.

Not unlike the American New Leftists of the 1960's, the dominant section of the Soviet dissidents expressed petty-bourgeois opposition to "the system," devoid of a class analysis based on Marxist principles. But unlike the youthful radicals of SDS, the mainstream Soviet dissidents of the late 1960's and early 1970's were mostly mature men with positions in and around the established intelligentsia. Their class and ideological ties with their Western counterparts led Sakharov, Litvinov, Chalidze and others to openly join the pro-imperialist camp. This lesson must not be lost on the next generation of Soviet oppositionists.

An important attempt to comment on the dissident movement and point a path for future struggle is Russian historian Roy Medvedev's book, recently released in English translation, *On Socialist Democracy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975). One of the virtues of this book is that it does not artificially lump all "Soviet dissidents" together, instead analyzing and polemicizing with various currents.

Medvedev is in a favorable position to comment on Soviet politics. He seems to be untainted by any suspicion of collaboration with imperialism (he has not written any appeals to imperialist agencies) or with the repressive organs of the Soviet bureaucracy. Medvedev consistently defended persecuted Soviet dissidents, including those he disagrees with; he defended Solzhenitsyn's right to publish in the USSR and protested his expulsion from the country. In fact, Medvedev's reputation as an honorable man is so good that when Solzhenitsyn, after his deportation, launched a vicious attack on the historian, even many members of the conservative American academic community were shocked.

Medvedev joined the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) after 1956 and attempted to struggle for liberal reforms from within the party. He was

allowed access to government and party archives and from these and unofficial sources he was able to write his major work, *Let History Judge*, which was the cause of his expulsion from the party in 1969.

Let History Judge was a passionate indictment of Stalinism which attempted to explain its rise from a Marxist point of view. It was an impressive achievement because, despite a number of factual errors reflecting Medvedev's flawed sources, the book presented an essentially accurate picture of the history of the Stalin era. *Let History Judge* was a subjectively honest reconstruction of the Stalin period, without the falsifications of Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*. Medvedev saw the rise of bureaucracy while Solzhenitsyn equated Lenin and Stalin and saw the whole of the post-October experience as a pogrom against the Russian Orthodox Church.

But *Let History Judge* was flawed by eclecticism and its adherence to the "personality cult" approach; everything that was bad, blame on Stalin or Beria; everything that was good, attribute to the party and the people. It should be remembered that Medvedev originally wrote his book for publication and so may have downplayed certain historical events, such as the role of the Left Opposition in the struggle for Soviet democracy. He is also evidently unaware of Trotsky's post-1928 writings, including numerous analyses of the degeneration of the Soviet state under the parasitic rule of the Stalinist bureaucratic caste.

With his access to "underground" sources and to certain sympathetic spirits in the party, Medvedev has gained an authoritative voice among the various anti-Stalinist socialist tendencies. In the West he has been used by such slimy opportunists as the Socialist Workers Party as an antidote to Solzhenitsyn.

On Socialist Democracy laments that "among the masses there is a growing mood of conscious political indifference, side by side with a heightened interest on the part of some people in religion and Western propaganda." To counteract these tendencies, Medvedev presents a program of gradual but far-reaching democratic reforms.

It is difficult to assign Medvedev a precise political slot. His insistence that democratization must have the support of a section of the ruling bureaucracy would make him a liberal Stalinist. But he advocates what in the USSR is an incredible heresy: a multi-party system. No section of the Brezhnev bureaucracy can support such a program. In Hungary in 1956, as the Russian army moved in to cut short a dual-power situation, the Imre Nagy régime sought to survive by forming a coalition government, ending one-party rule, condemning the Warsaw Pact and



Roy Medvedev

New York Times

even crossing the class line to appeal to the imperialist United Nations. Under the gun, a section of the bureaucracy can become very "liberal" indeed—but not without destroying itself.

Medvedev's views are characterized by a tension between what roughly approximates pre-1917 Menshevik/socialist and humanist sensibilities and a commitment to defend the conquests of the October Revolution. His methodology is borrowed from Kautskyan social democracy, yet Kautsky sided with the imperialists against the Soviet regime while Medvedev defends collectivized property. He combines a program for self-reform of the bureaucracy and a yearning for socialist freedoms. In this he is not different from other "liberal" bureaucratic reformers such as Dubček or Nagy. It takes a "Prague Spring" or a Hungarian Revolution to see where they stand.

Medvedev explicitly identifies with those rightward-moving CP's which are no longer loyal to the Kremlin, such as the Italian and Australian. His naive confidence in these parliamentarist parties is not simply a personal quirk; even the most militant among the Soviet underground have appealed to various CP's, even, pathetically, to the CPUSA. Medvedev almost certainly realizes that these parties have no intention of taking power in their own countries; they are viewed rather as allies in the democratization of the CPSU. It is this limitation of Medvedev's outlook which defines him fundamentally as a liberal Stalinist; he believes in the possibility of a liberalized "socialism ('with a human face') in one country."

On Socialist Democracy opposes the "leftism" of the neo-Stalinists (a category into which Medvedev lumps a whole range of people, from the Maoists to the stone-faced "Old Guard" of the KGB) and the "leftism" of such moderate socialist reformers as Grigorenko. While some of the positions Medvedev attributes to the Grigorenko circle—notably direct worker ownership operating through a market system—are indeed anarchist rather than Marxist, it is clear that Medvedev opposes Grigorenko mainly because of the latter's intransigent

hostility to the Brezhnev bureaucracy.

How does Medvedev regard the bureaucracy? First, he admits its existence: "While I do not believe that the bureaucracy can be described as some kind of new class, I am forced to agree that those in charge of Soviet society now constitute a definite stratum sharing certain customs and rules of conduct." He debunks notions that reform will automatically come from economic progress:

"...life is becoming more and more complex and bureaucrats are constantly pursued by failure. This is the reason why scientists and specialists are being drawn into the *apparat*, committees and commissions of experts are being created, but at the same time undemocratic methods of administration remain intact. In other words, the bureaucrats are being replaced by knowledgeable and more efficient technocrats.... But technocracy, as a distinctive form of "socialist managerialism," cannot resolve the basic problems of Soviet society. There is only one way to deal with them, only one acceptable alternative to bureaucracy, and that is genuine democratization."

While admitting the existence of a bureaucracy, Medvedev opposes any attempt to overthrow it. In his attitude there is something of the 19th-century intellectuals' dread of the "dark, silent masses" of Russia; to unleash those masses would result in anarchy, terror, perhaps even capitalist restoration. Medvedev's attitude is typical of the Russian intelligentsia, captured best by the great poet Aleksandr Pushkin, a radical in his time, who wrote of the Pugachev peasant uprising:

"God forbid that we should ever see a Russian rebellion—mindless and pitiless. Those in our country who are dreaming up impossible revolutions are either



Wally McNamee/Newsweek

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn

young and do not know our people, or are themselves cruel-hearted...."

"The Captain's Daughter"

Medvedev hopes for democratization from the top down, passively supported by the workers: "It is wrong to exclude the possibility of an alliance between the best of the intelligentsia supported by the people and the most forward-looking individuals in the governing *apparat*." Ignoring the irrational component of bureaucracy, Medvedev seems to be trying to convince the *apparatchiki*, who hold to their positions with all the stubbornness of a privileged caste, that democratization is in their own rational interests. In his essay, "Problems of Democratization and Detente" (*New Left Review*, January-February 1974), he stressed that democratization was "the most important precondition for an acceleration of the economic, social and

continued on page 11



Left Oppositionists at exile colony in Siberia demonstrate on anniversary of Bolshevik Revolution. Center banner, with pictures of Lenin and Trotsky, says: "Long Live the Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

Down with the McCarran-Walter Act!

Bay Area Demo Demands Visa For Blanco



Hugo Blanco

Militant

SAN FRANCISCO, October 16—The S.F. Federal Building was the site of a spirited protest today by 55 labor and left militants against the U.S. State Department's denial of an entry visa to Peruvian socialist Hugo Blanco. The demonstration, initiated by the Partisan Defense Committee (PDC) under the slogans "Let Hugo Blanco into the U.S." and "Smash the McCarran-Walter Act," was actively supported by the Spartacist League, Spartacus Youth League, Committee for Working Class Studies, Socialist League (DC), International Workers Party, the Militant Caucus of the ILWU and a number of independent militants. Conspicuous by their absence were the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and the SWP-led U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLA).

The SWP and USLA not only abstained from this important effort to build mass support for Blanco's freedom of entry into the U.S., but actively attempted to sabotage the effort! The initial proposal to the SWP for united action was met with open hostility, and a few days later a leading SWP supporter inquired as to the time and date of the planning meeting for the rally—stating that he wanted to come to urge those organizations backing the effort to withdraw their endorsement.

When a meeting of the October Coalition at the University of California/Berkeley was approached to support the demonstration, SWP supporters present argued against the proposal. They stated that other demonstrations were already planned (which weren't), that Blanco wanted only telegrams to Kissinger (no demonstrations, please!), that no one should participate in activities in support of Blanco's



WV Photo

Bay Area demonstrators protest U.S. exclusion of Hugo Blanco and against anti-communist McCarran-Walter Act, October 16.

case except those initiated by USLA, etc. This sectarianism only weakens the fight to gain admission for Blanco and criminally undermines an excellent opportunity for a struggle to strike down the anti-red McCarran-Walter Act.

Despite the attempted sabotage by the SWP and USLA, a militant picket line assembled at noon and took up the demands of the demonstration, as well as enthusiastically chanting such slogans as "Freedom of Entry for Hugo Blanco—Hanoi Trial for Henry Kissinger." The picketing was followed by a rally with a speech by union militant Bob Mandel, executive board member of ILWU Local 6 and a member of the Militant Caucus of that union. Mandel outlined briefly the pernicious history of such anti-communist exclusionism and underscored the danger this

legislation continues to pose to the international labor movement. He pointed out that the McCarran-Walter Act is not only being used to keep militants like Blanco out of the country, but also to close U.S. borders to refugee Chilean militants facing prison, torture and the firing squads of the murderous junta.

With today's demonstration, the PDC—an anti-sectarian legal defense organization whose class-struggle policies are in accordance with the views of the Spartacist League—has shown the way forward for defense against capitalist victimization and persecution of the international labor movement. It stands in sharp contrast to the practices of the reformist SWP, which seeks not genuine and militant defense of the oppressed but to cultivate a "respectable" image among bourgeois liberals.

Build Philip Allen Defense!

LOS ANGELES, October 20—Philip Allen, the black college student wrongly convicted of killing a cop, remains behind bars in a prison system where racist savagery is the daily routine. Every day in jail increases the danger to his life. No effort can be spared to free this victim of the frame-up system which the ruling class attempts to pass off as "equal justice before the law."

Shortly after the conviction the prosecution demagogically charged that the defendant was an "agitator" because he spoke at a Los Angeles City College (LACC) rally protesting that he is innocent. The judge revoked bail. This blatant denial of even the most minimal democratic rights has brought the American Civil Liberties Union into the case.

The Spartacus Youth League (SYL) and other supporters of Philip Allen have worked hard on his behalf, gathering 1,400 signatures in a single week circulating a defense petition at LACC. The SYL had been suspended for its active support of Allen on the campus where he was a student. Last Thursday at a rally called by the Partisan Defense Committee (PDC), 35 students set up a spirited picket line and handed the petition to the LACC administration. It read in part:

"Now the administration has attacked the SYL singling out the SYL as builders of

the Philip Allen defense rally.... We the undersigned therefore demand: Free Philip Allen! Hands off the SYL - Rescind the suspension!"

That evening Ellery Allen, Philip's mother, spoke to an audience of 75 at LACC's Newman Center. She movingly described the blatant racist injustice perpetrated against her son. After her presentation, badly needed defense funds were collected.

The SYL, now reinstated at LACC, has called for a unified defense committee on campus. It points out that a broad-based campaign of the sort that saved Joan Little is needed to free Philip Allen.

The News Blackout

Philip Allen's supporters recognize the importance of bringing the truth about this case to the public. But they face one of the most effective news blackouts in recent L.A. history. The influential *Los Angeles Times* has not covered the case since January 2 when it ran a small story about the arrest on New Year's Eve. During the entire seven-week trial, the paper's readers were never informed that a 5'3", 135-pound youth was being prosecuted for allegedly overpowering a detachment of burly sheriff's deputies, supposedly killing one and wounding two

more. They never read about the issues in the case or the racist slurs made against the defendant by the prosecutor. Allen's conviction and even the outrageous bail revocation have met with total, criminal silence by the bourgeois news media in Los Angeles.

The reason for the news blackout is obvious. Even the barest statement of the facts destroys the web of lies created by the Sheriff's Office and raises dangerous questions. For instance, if a single black youth, lying on the ground while being badly beaten, did not disarm and shoot the cops with a police revolver, then what did happen that night? To ask the question is to answer it. Philip Allen has been made the scapegoat for brutal racist bunglers in uniform. The *Los Angeles Times* and the rest of the media, anxious to protect the reputation and conceal the criminality of their "peace officers," have kept the lid on this case. But Philip Allen's defenders continue the struggle, and this vicious racist frame-up will not remain hidden for long.

The Partisan Defense Committee urges WV readers to send messages of support and contributions to: Philip L. Allen Defense Committee of the First Unitarian Church, 2936 West 8th Street, Los Angeles, CA 90005. ■

Statement of Support to Philip Allen Defense Committee

October 11, 1975

The Committee for a Militant UAW pledges its full support to the defense of Philip Allen.

We are outraged at this blatantly racist attack on an innocent black student. We intend to raise this issue in our local union and expose this despicable frame-up attempt. The labor movement must be mobilized in defense of Philip Allen. Philip Allen *must not* become a martyr—he must be freed.

There is no justice for working people in the bourgeois courts!
FREE PHILIP ALLEN!!

In Solidarity,

Darlene Fujino
Secretary/Treasurer
Committee for a Militant UAW
Local 1364
Fremont, California

cc Partisan Defense Committee

Soviets....

(continued from page 6)

proceed to recognize." The unit delegate assemblies (ADU's) will participate in the local popular assemblies as watchdogs, and the assemblies may undertake "self-defense" (i.e., form militias) only on the MFA's initiative and under its control. Significantly, the national popular assembly is put off indefinitely as the "last and distant stage in this structure." In the "transition period" all "organs of people's power" will be subordinate to the MFA's Supreme Revolutionary Council!

The institutionalization of the "MFA-People Alliance" set out in the "guide document," and reaffirmed in the "COP-CON document" which was endorsed by the organizations forming the "Revolutionary United Front" on August 25, is the most blatant class collaboration—tying the workers to the bourgeois officer corps. If implemented it would prevent the workers commissions from becoming organs of dual power. The "MFA-People Alliance" is just as much a roadblock to revolution as the CP's participation in popular-front governments—in fact, even more of a danger because of the support to it from the centrists and left-reformists. The *Rouge* article puts its finger on the key issue, commenting: "The essential thing, however, is that...the 'guide document' appears to the workers as a general expression of their aspirations...." The Pabloists of the LCR and LCI capitulate to these illusions; an authentic Trotskyist party would fight them, calling for independence of the workers commissions and popular assemblies from the MFA, and for the formation of soldiers committees in order to split the army and shatter the officer corps.

It is precisely independence from the bourgeois state that makes a soviet more than a committee—the potential structure for the creation of a proletarian state. Those who today support the "MFA-People Alliance" are playing the same role as the social democratic USPD in 1918 when it sought to combine the German soviets with the bourgeois parliament. This inevitably meant the destruction of the soviets and the strangling of the revolution.

The soviets must not only be independent of the capitalist state, but must possess an organizational structure capable of drawing in the most backward masses. Its flexibility (delegates recallable at any time), directness (election in mass assemblies) and link to the source of working-class power (representation by workplace) give the soviet form the ability to reduce bureaucracy to a minimum, rapidly reflect shifts in the masses' opinion, formulate a revolutionary program through open debate and translate decisions into effective action.

Trotsky repeatedly asserted that "the soviet form does not contain any mystic power." In the abstract, he was prepared to admit that the revolutionary vanguard party or even a trade union (under revolutionary leadership) could fulfill the same functions. He pointed to Lenin's view after the 1917 July Days (when the leaders of the soviets were arresting the Bolsheviks) that the factory committees could become the organizational vehicles for the struggle for power. But as a practical proposition the likelihood is nil of a Leninist party encompassing the whole of the proletariat before the revolution, or of a trade union transforming itself from an instrument of "guerrilla war against the effects of the existing system" into an organ of insurrectionary assault on capitalism.

A concrete example of what the consequences of renouncing soviets can mean in a revolutionary situation was given by Andrés Nin during the Spanish Civil War. Having abandoned the Trotskyist movement to become a leader of the POUM (Workers Party of Marxist Unification), Nin soon began denouncing "mechanical applications" of the experience of the Russian Revolution.

"In Russia there was no democratic tradition. No tradition or organization

and struggle in the proletariat.... One can understand, therefore, the importance which the soviets assumed: the proletariat did not have its own organizations.... Our proletariat already had its trade unions, its parties, its own organizations: that is why soviets did not arise with us.... The existence of a workers movement under anarchist influence poses new problems, requires different tactics. The CNT is a potentially revolutionary organization, despite its prejudices and wrong positions...."

—*La Batalla*, 26 April 1937

This is false to the core. In the first place soviet-type organs of dual power *did* arise in Spain, the most notable being the "Central Council of Anti-Fascist Militias of Catalonia." The reason it never became a workers government is that the Generalitat—Companys' bourgeois Catalan government, of which the POUM was a part—dissolved it! But while this "explanation" was only an excuse for following the Anarchists into the Generalitat, the "theory" necessarily meant capitulation to the CNT bureaucracy, just as the USec majority capitulates to the Portuguese MFA.

Embryos of Dual Power in Portugal?

Clearly there is no national soviet in Portugal today; certainly the MFA not only will not, but *cannot* set up an organ of workers power. Yet there are numerous *comissões* of various types that are neither part of the Intersindical union federation nor controlled by the armed forces. What is the character of these bodies? Are they perhaps "embryos" of workers power, comparable to factory committees, which the "Transitional Program" describes as "dual power inside the factory"?

It is first necessary to determine what

distinguishes a factory committee from a trade union. Where a closed shop has already been instituted, Trotsky wrote, the formal membership may coincide. "The prime significance of the committee, however, lies in the fact that it becomes the militant staff for such working-class layers as the trade union is usually incapable of moving to action." By this criterion there are very few factory committees in Portugal, perhaps no more than a handful.

The best known would be the Lisnave shipyards workers commission. On several occasions it has mobilized virtually the entire personnel for mass anti-government demonstrations. When Lisnave workers carried out an illegal demonstration on 12 September 1974 against the government's anti-strike law—a demonstration in which they faced down a squadron of paratroopers as they left the plant gates—the decision was taken by a general assembly. Out of 6,000 present, only 25 voted against despite the CP's opposition (*Revolução*, 21 September 1974). Moreover, the statutes of the workers commission provide that delegates can be recalled at any time (see the OCI brochure, "Problèmes de la révolution portugaise," 1974).

But the majority of workers commissions are not factory committees in this sense. A typical example is the Timex workers commission. There are 11 unions at Timex, the largest being the watchmakers' union (controlled by the MRPP). Consequently, the main organ for negotiating with the boss is the workers commission (also controlled by the MRPP).

In other enterprises a different dynamic has developed, deriving from the tactics of the CP under the Salazar dictatorship. During the late 1960's and early 1970's the Stalinists sought to take control of the fascist unions. Since the latter were in fact state-controlled, the real organs of trade-union struggle were the clandestine workers commissions. This pattern changed only slightly after April 25, for the CP promptly took over most of the Salazarist unions (giving rise to the Intersindical federation) and followed a bitter-end strikebreaking policy. Thus a not uncommon pattern is that of *two* unions per enterprise: one that leads strikes (the workers commission) and one that breaks strikes (the Intersindical union)!

What is true of the workers commissions is also true of the neighborhood commissions. In explaining why it believed a popular assembly could not be formed at the moment in Vila Nova de Gaia (next to Porto), the left-social-democratic MES argued that "most of the neighborhood commissions, at this time, are either oriented toward economic demands or are organs in which parties attempt to impose themselves..." (*Poder Popular*, 25 September). In the industrial town of Setubal, south of Lisbon, there is a municipal popular assembly, but two of the neighborhood commissions dominated by Maoists refuse to cooperate because of Communist Party preponderance in the assembly (*Politique Hebdo*, 18-24 September). The popular vigilance committees, "committees to defend the revolution" and similar bodies are largely CP-controlled.

The popular assemblies, in contrast to the workers and neighborhood commissions, are few in number and several were set up by the local military units. (At the beginning of August there were reportedly five in the Lisbon area, two of which had been set up prior to the MFA "guide document.") However, because of the dissension in the MFA, the officers have apparently not had time to "normalize" the popular assemblies, particularly given the trouble they have had with their own unit delegate assemblies. The only active military participation appears to be from "far-left" regiments, such as the RALIS artillery unit (Marvila popular assembly). At the other extreme is the popular assembly of Amadora, an industrial town across the river from Lisbon, in which the local military unit (the commandos) does

not participate because its right-wing commander dissolved the ADU.

In addition there is a "municipal council of Porto." Under the previous left-wing governor of the Porto military region, the city's military administrative committee worked closely with and subsidized the neighborhood commissions which, together with the workers commissions and ADU's, were grouped together in a "municipal council." However, the present SP civil governor has refused to recognize the council since it is not in the (Caetanist) administrative code. The municipal council is continuing its attempts to gain recognition as a component of the local bourgeois government apparatus.

In the military there is even more diversity and, in some places, the struggle for independence from the bourgeoisie is even farther advanced than among the workers commissions, due to the heated conflict between MFA commanders and various types of soldiers committees. The most widespread form of democratic representation in the barracks is the unit delegate assembly, apparently the norm throughout the country. While it is only advisory and some commanders seek to bypass it (such as by keeping troops on useless maneuvers for days to prevent them from meeting), it is certainly disruptive to bourgeois military discipline.

However, the ADU's are not necessarily counterposed to the officer corps. In contrast, the clandestine "Soldiers United Will Win" (SUV) started out as a leftist political organization within the barracks calling for the formation of elected soldiers committees and the destruction of the capitalist army. While they remain politically defined—rather than inclusive—and include a number of leftist officers, in some units the SUV's appear to have acted as a focus for generalized discontent among the enlisted men. In addition, during the CICAP barracks revolt in Porto earlier this month a special "struggle committee" was elected from the units present in the artillery regiment barracks; and there are now the first reports of elected soldiers' committees in the Lisbon area. The recent comment by General Carlos Fabião, the army chief of staff, about these groups is characteristic of the attitude of the military hierarchy: "I have reservations because it is a horizontal organisation and in the army we have a vertical organisation" (*Economist*, 18 October). True enough.

In short, there are a wide variety of "organs of people's power" in Portugal today. What attitude should revolutionaries take toward them? On the one hand it would be a serious overestimation of the level of class consciousness to view the workers commissions as factory committees, and the local popular assemblies as district soviets. On the other hand it would be disastrous to dismiss the popular assemblies as simply transmission belts for the MFA and the workers commissions as ersatz trade unions.

In reality, the nature of these organs is not clearly defined, not even that of the Porto "municipal council" which is seeking to become part of the bourgeois state apparatus. While the workers commissions are not yet factory committees, neither are they saddled with the cumbersome bureaucracy of the trade unions which would make them a hindrance as organs of revolutionary struggle. Like the British shop stewards councils in the 1926 general strike and the German strike committees in 1918, the Portuguese *comissões operárias* can be transformed into factory committees and united into soviets. The task of Trotskyists in Portugal is not to invent imaginary soviets but to struggle within the existing mass organizations of the working class to build and unite workers councils nationwide, drawing in the workers commissions, popular vigilance committees, soldiers committees, neighborhood and agricultural workers commissions for the struggle for power!

TO BE CONTINUED

SPARTACIST LEAGUE LOCAL DIRECTORY

ANN ARBOR (313) 662-1548
c/o SYL, Box 592
Ann Arbor, MI 48107

BERKELEY/
OAKLAND (415) 653-4668
Box 23372
Oakland, CA 94623

BLOOMINGTON .. (812) 332-3235
(Indiana)

BOSTON (617) 492-3928
Box 188 (617) 436-1497
M.I.T. Station
Cambridge, MA 02139

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

CLEVELAND (216) 621-3379
Box 6765,
Cleveland, OH 44101

DETROIT (313) 881-1632
Box 663A, General P.O.,
Detroit, MI 48232

HOUSTON (713) 921-7253
Box 9054,
Houston, TX 77011

LOS ANGELES (213) 485-1838
Box 26282, Edendale Station,
Los Angeles, CA 90026

MADISON (608) 257-4212
c/o SYL, Box 3334,
Madison, WI 53704

NEW YORK (212) 925-2426
Box 1377, G.P.O.,
New York, NY 10001

PHILADELPHIA ... (215) 667-5695
Box 25601,
Philadelphia, PA 19144

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 6867, Station A
Toronto, Ontario

VANCOUVER (604) 299-5306
Box 26, Station A
Vancouver, B.C.

Fascists in Portugal...

(continued from page 1)

government official said at a luncheon with reporters. "We wouldn't expect to be out of the capital for more than a week or a month at the most."

However, the generals are not sitting on their hands. Last week word leaked out that 400 former commandos with experience in the African colonial wars are being recalled to turn the AMI into an operational strike force. In addition, General Francisco da Costa Gomes (president and armed forces chief of staff) ordered civilian armed militias to turn in their arms within eight days.

Fascists and Rightist Ultras Emerge

Freitas do Amaral, leader of the conservative Social Democratic Center (CDS) party, recently remarked that "There is no authority, no law and order,

no discipline, no police and no army. ... It is nonsense to talk about government when there is no state." The present vacuum of authority must soon be filled. While the MFA "moderates," together with their Popular Democratic Party (PPD) and Socialist Party (SP) allies, are seeking to do so by cracking down on leftist dissidents in the armed forces and strengthening the present government, the extreme right has been mobilizing for more "decisive" action. For weeks the CP has been claiming that the wave of anti-communist terror in the north was well organized by the bourgeois parties (both PPD and CDS), with the participation of former PIDE (Salazarist political police) agents. This was recently borne out by an American journalist who interviewed "one of Rio Maior's most prosperous businessmen." (Rio Maior is where the first CP office was burned down.)

"He, too, indicated he was a private CDS supporter, and he was very emphatic in his assertion that the burnings of Communist party headquarters hadn't been spontaneous—as the U.S. press

indicated—but the work of an organized network."

Village Voice, 6 October

The *Voice* reporter also quoted the remark by SP leader António Reis (commenting on the Rio Maior events) that "a new kind of popular, mass-based fascism is growing in Portugal."

Several of the ultra-rightist leaders are presently in exile. Chief among them is former General António de Spínola, who was once governor-general of the colony of Guinea-Bissau, later armed forces chief of staff under Salazar's successor Marcello Caetano, and then head of the military junta which took power after toppling Caetano. Having failed to crush the left with a mobilization of the "silent majority" in September 1974 and a bungled coup last March 11, Spínola fled to Brazil via Spain. He now heads up the "Democratic Movement for the Liberation of Portugal" (MDLP) whose declared aim is to "establish a liberal and pluralist democracy by driving communism from the country" (*Le Monde*, 10 October).

The MDLP is reportedly financed in part by the former Companhia União

Fabril (CUF) trust, whose owners are also in exile, and Spínola's Madrid envoy Alpoim Calvão is said to be closely tied to the Portuguese Liberation Army (ELP) which has trained mercenary commando units just over the border in Spain. The ELP was first discovered during the March 11 coup attempt and two CIA officers advising the "army" were photographed at a meeting in Spain. Although the U.S. press exhibited some skepticism as to the existence of the ELP last spring, there was considerably less doubt after it bombed the palace in which the current premier, Admiral José Pinheiro de Azevedo, was staying in September.

Secret armies are not likely to play a key role in Portugal, for even the disintegrating Portuguese armed forces could easily repel a Bay of Pigs-type invasion. These groups place their hopes not on commando operations but on their fifth columnists within the country. As MDLP leader Calvão remarked in an interview, "There will be no classic invasion of Portugal because we are there already" (*Le Monde*, 22 September). And there are plenty of ultra-rightists there already, including in the MFA. A prime example is Major Pires Veloso in northern Portugal, who would certainly be a main support for any reactionary coup. It is the preservation of an officer corps which includes such future Pinochets that is the meaning of the slogan of an "MFA-People Alliance" which the reformists have endlessly chanted. Only by destroying the bourgeois officer corps can the fascists' fifth column be smashed!

Once More on the SP and the Fascists

During recent months a particularly treacherous role has been played by the Portuguese Socialist Party of Mario Soares. Leaving the coalition government in mid-July to protest plans for "Communist dictatorship," the SP mounted a campaign of demonstrations demanding the ouster of Premier Gonçalves. Its program called for disarming the workers militias and crushing all embryonic forms of dual power. And behind its lead, openly counterrevolutionary forces mounted a campaign of rightist terror.

Mario Soares' press agents abroad, including the ex-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) in the U.S., assert that, on the contrary, the SP demonstrations represented a *leftist* response to CP bureaucratism. In recent forums SWP leaders—after lamely defending the Portuguese SP against now-proven charges of CIA financing running into millions of dollars a month—have accused the Spartacist League of ignoring the difference between the SP demonstrations and the rightist terror.

There is now additional confirmation of the role the SP has been playing in fronting for reaction. In a perceptive series on his recent Portugal trip, *Village Voice* reporter Paul Cowan (who arrived in Lisbon sympathetic to the Socialists) concluded: "...the Portuguese Socialist party was being used as a Trojan horse for Portugal's right wing—providing a respectable anti-Communist cover for people who oppose programs, like land reform, decolonization, workers' control of industry, that Socialists are pledged to support." He also reported that General Galvão de Melo confirmed to him that the CDS had urged many supporters to vote SP in the April 25 elections: "It was better for people to vote for the Socialists than for the CDS because we didn't want the military to realize how much power we had" (*Village Voice*, 6 October).

Even more significant was a recent interview by Mario Soares published in *Le Monde* (3 October). Far from sharply distinguishing SP demonstrations from the rightist terror, Soares referred approvingly to "the popular uprising against the CP in the country, especially north of the Tagus [River]" as the main factor in stopping an alleged CP power grab. "There have been attempts to present this uprising as an anti-communist pogrom," he went on. "But it was a reaction of self-defense by the

Sub Drive Success!



WV Photo

As the fall *Workers Vanguard* subscription drive comes to a successful end, the final tally reflects a significant numerical and geographic expansion of the subscription base for the weekly *Workers Vanguard* and *Young Spartacus*, monthly newspaper of the Spartacus Youth League. While almost half of the total subs were full-year WV subscriptions, well over 400 YSp subs and over 150 *Women and Revolution* subs were also sold. The tally below does not reflect the dozens of subs sold by our Canadian comrades of the Trotskyist League nor the many letters of support we have received from friends and subscribers worldwide. *Workers Vanguard* thanks those whose energy and persistence ensured the success of the sub-drive campaign.

19 September-16 October 1975 Final Report

Area	total to date	quota	percent fulfilled
Bloomington	36	35	103%
Boston	177	135	131%
Chicago	243	200	122%
Cleveland	151	140	108%
Detroit	147	130	113%
East Bay	230	200	115%
Houston	109	70	156%
Ithaca	49	40	122%
Los Angeles	309	200	154%
Madison	68	60	113%
New York City	502	400	126%
Philadelphia	182	120	152%
San Francisco	123	110	112%
At Large	57	50	114%
TOTAL	2383	1890	126%

Build the Weekly

WORKERS VANGUARD

Name _____
 Address _____
 City _____ State _____
 Zip _____ Phone _____

Workers Vanguard (includes *Spartacist*)
 \$5/48 issues \$2/16 issues (Introductory)

Women and Revolution *Young Spartacus*
 \$1/4 issues \$2/11 issues

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

Subscribe Now!

Last Chance! SUB-DRIVE SPECIAL

\$6 for 48 issues of **WORKERS VANGUARD**, and 11 issues of **YOUNG SPARTACUS**

populace....The right exploited it; it profited from it. But the movement was spontaneous." While Soares may not have liked the lynch-mob atmosphere, this endorsement of the reactionary mobilization is unambiguous.

Despite the counterrevolutionary policies of its leaders, the reformist, social-democratic SP is the largest workers party in Portugal. It has influence in a number of unions (recently winning a series of elections in white-collar unions in conjunction with the Maoist MRPP). Like the reformist CP, the Socialist Party is simultaneously bourgeois in its policies and working-class in its composition and organic ties to the labor movement. Should the reactionary forces it has fronted for take over, the SP would be destroyed. Moreover, while the SP is currently to the right of the CP, allowing the latter to defend rebellious soldiers against the government, only nine months ago the SP was demagogically defending jailed Maoist unionists while Cunhal was the most uncompromising defender of law-and-order.

In struggling to build a revolutionary Trotskyist party in Portugal the strategy cannot consist of falling into line behind either the SP (as does the SWP) or the CP (the choice of the United Secretariat's European majority and of the Portuguese LCI). Constantly fighting for a revolutionary program leading to the establishing of workers rule, a Trotskyist propaganda group in Portugal would also put forward united-front proposals to the other workers parties in an attempt to mobilize the class for common action against the bourgeoisie and to break the proletarian base of the reformist and centrist parties from their misleaders.

During late 1974 and early 1975 the most important occasions for such united-front appeals were the defense of the workers movement against various anti-democratic decrees by the MFA (banning strikes, imposing censorship, arresting Maoists). During the rightist terror wave in July-August united defense of the offices of leftist organizations was an urgent task. And over the last 18 months the most pressing need—particularly acute today in the face of the rightist crackdown—has been for uniting the various workers, neighborhood and soldiers committees into a national soviet. But at all times the indispensable condition for a Leninist united front is the political independence of the Marxists and an unflinching struggle to build an independent Trotskyist party. ■

Big MAC ...

(continued from page 1)

before a Senate committee Friday that the city's bankruptcy would produce "a markedly adverse psychological reaction in the consumer and business sectors of the economy" exerting "an enormous downpull on general economic activity."

While all sectors of the bourgeoisie do not have the same estimate of the long-range effects of tipping New York over the brink, they share a common determination to force the municipal unions to the wall with layoffs, speed-up and the wage freeze. The Board of Education is being urged by anti-labor outfits like the United Parents Association and the City Club to resurrect demands that it failed to ram down the UFT's throat on the first round—cutting the number of paid sick days in half, extending teachers' workweeks, eliminating sabbatical leaves and the time allowed chapter chairmen to transact union business.

These vicious attacks, designed to reverse the gains won by public workers over a decade of unionization and struggle, are encouraged by the gutless capitulation of the city's labor bureaucrats, who continue to crawl from one bourgeois politician to another pleading for a fair shake. New York labor can defend itself only by a militant city-wide general strike against the bankers' austerity program. ■

Canadian Labor...

(continued from page 12)

action by the 22,000-member Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW), now in contract negotiations. When wage controls were announced last week, CUPW members were in the midst of voting a mandate for strike action to back up contract demands far exceeding the guidelines: the official demands are for a 71 percent pay increase in a one-year contract, with a 30-hour workweek and full cost-of-living escalator. Union negotiators had earlier rejected a conciliation report prepared by Judge Jean Moisan which sought to restrict CUPW members to 38 percent over 30 months (i.e., 15 percent annually), an amount identical to the sellout agreement between the Post Office and the Letter Carriers Union of Canada (LCUC) earlier this year. The government was prepared for a showdown, with postmaster general Bryce Mackasey vowing to keep the post office shut down "for two or three months" if necessary to force the union to knuckle under.

CUPW members (inside postal workers) presently have an absurdly low \$4.58 per hour base rate and face massive dislocation and increased surveillance under a new automation scheme. CUPW has been without a contract for over a year, ever since its bureaucrat-engineered disaffiliation from a joint bargaining unit with the LCUC (representing outside workers). Although union tops are now turning a militant face toward the government with "radical" contract demands and a defiant posture, CUPW national president Joe Davidson and his cronies have guaranteed a sellout in advance by their refusal to defend militant posties victimized in an earlier bout of government union-busting moves. This May, when management fired 47 militants and suspended 900 others for protesting the use of scab "casual" labor in Montreal, Davidson did not lift a finger to help the embattled unionists.

The new wage control package has given Davidson the handle he needs to force an inadequate settlement on the CUPW ranks. When the new finance minister Donald Macdonald introduced the legislation in Parliament he announced an escape clause enabling CUPW to legally settle for more than the 10 percent maximum: "There may also be other grounds for exception," said Mac-

donald, "such as increases needed to maintain long-established historical relationships between wages in closely related groups and other special cases of equity." Postmaster general Mackasey explained that inside workers would be entitled to wage increases corresponding to those of LCUC drivers and carriers—exactly what was provided for in the conciliation report. Davidson promptly fell into line behind his friends in Ottawa, ignoring a strong pro-strike vote nationwide, and resumed sham negotiations while greasing the skids for a sellout.

If the government can force CUPW to heel it will have won the first major battle for implementation of the new controls. The only road forward for Canadian labor in the face of this severe attack is the road of intransigent class struggle. While with one hand the government moves to crush strikes and limit wages, with the other it uses its agents within the workers movement—the pro-capitalist bureaucracy—to ensure "labor peace" by integrating them into government boards like the federal Labor Relations Council.

Militant workers must demand: Smash Trudeau's austerity program! For massive labor demonstrations and strike action to smash Trudeau's wage controls! No to the Moisan Report—For a joint postal strike to break the wage guidelines! Labor off government boards! End unemployment—Jobs for all through a shorter workweek with no loss in pay!

Militants must build class-struggle caucuses in the unions on a full anti-capitalist political program in order to throw out the sellout bureaucrats and break the NDP's reformist stranglehold. The only possible way to stop inflation is through rational economic planning and the expropriation of the capitalists under a workers government. The construction of a revolutionary Trotskyist party is the key to laying the basis for finishing, once and for all, with the anti-labor programs of the Trudeaus, Mackaseys and their social-democratic sidekicks. ■

Soviet Dissidents...

(continued from page 7)

cultural development of our country."

Because Medvedev believes in the ultimate triumph of socialism in one country, his position is the curious one of a Stalinist rejecting Stalinism as anachronistic. This partial reconciliation to the bureaucracy is indeed a step back from *Let History Judge*, which analyzed with care the social, economic and cultural conditions which allowed Stalinism to arise. A fundamental factor in this process was national isolation; he who denies the world revolution objectively supports the rule of the bureaucracy or of imperialism. By upholding the policy of "peaceful coexistence," Medvedev objectively supports the continued existence of capitalism—and thus of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the institutionalized reflection of imperialist pressure within the deformed workers states.

Medvedev supports détente and disarmament (though recognizing short-term disadvantages such as increased repression at home to counteract "Westernizing" pressures). He writes:

"Right-wing circles in the West, on the contrary, exploit any shortcomings in the USSR and any acts of oppression by the Soviet state for their own demagogic ends; their aim is not to assist the victory of 'socialism with a human face' but to discredit both socialism and communism.... However, in a more distant future—although this may not be a very comforting prognosis—détente will undoubtedly contribute to the extension of democratic rights and liberties in our country."

—"Problems of Democratization and Detente"

Medvedev bases his rejection of the idea of a violent overturn of the bureaucracy on one quote from Lenin, that there

is no way to "lance the bureaucratic boil, to wipe bureaucracy from the face of the earth." "'Surgery in this case,' wrote Lenin, 'is absurd, it cannot work. There can only be a slow healing process—other alternatives are fraudulent or naïve'."

Certainly Lenin would have been over-hasty had he called for political revolution in the early 1920's. But since Lenin's early attempts to check the rise of the bureaucracy, much water has passed under the bridge: the defeat of the Left Opposition, the ruinous collectivization, the Comintern's refusal to fight the rise of fascism in Germany, the betrayal of the Spanish revolution, the purges, and so on. Although brittle and lacking both a new and characteristic class relationship to the means of production and a self-justifying ideology, the parasitic bureaucracy of the deformed workers states still possesses an awesome coercive power and will cling desperately to its privileges. What is necessary is not mere reform—or even "lancing the bureaucratic boil"—but radical surgery, through a proletarian political revolution, to excise this cancerous growth!

Medvedev is explicitly legalistic: "as for the ways and means of political struggle, they must be absolutely legal and constitutional." Unlike the legalist fetishism of the Yakir-Krasin group and the early Sakharov, for example, Medvedev's impulse seems to stem from a desire not to engage the bureaucracy and push it into further repression. Lacking faith in the Russian proletariat or the international revolution, Medvedev can pose only a gradual process of democratization at a snail's pace.

Medvedev dismisses the Trotskyists' struggle against the bureaucracy, although grudgingly admitting that "some of their criticisms contained a considerable measure of truth." He lumps Trotskyism together with Maoism as ultra-left radicals who "come out into the streets of Paris and Rome bearing portraits of Stalin, Trotsky and Mao-Tse-tung." This amalgam is absurd. But since Medvedev falsely regards Stalin and Mao as left dogmatists committed to a hard anti-imperialist stance, there is a certain internal logic to this identification. And we Trotskyists are closer to the young militants who demonstrate with portraits of Stalin and Mao than to the Italian CP's Enrico Berlinguer.

The pro-imperialist Sakharov and the bureaucratic reformer Medvedev do not exhaust the currents of the diverse Soviet dissidents. A recent appeal "To the Communists of Europe and the USA" (*Inprecor*, 3 July 1975) refers to a number of clandestine groups that undoubtedly would be dismissed as "leftist" by Medvedev: All Power to the Soviets, Union of Communards, Young Worker, Communard, Urals Worker, Leninist Ideas in Practice.

But while we may feel more kinship with wild-eyed primitivist revolutionaries than with the sane and sober Medvedev, sanity and sobriety are valuable. So are thoughtful attempts at Marxist analysis of Stalinism and the Soviet dissident movement. Just as all serious Trotskyists should read Isaac Deutscher and learn from his knowledge and his mistakes, so should the current generation of Soviet oppositionists study Medvedev in order to formulate their own, revolutionary program: the program of authentic Trotskyism. ■

CUPW Strikes Canada P.O.

OCTOBER 21—As we go to press Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) officials have announced a national postal strike following the breakdown of negotiations. CUPW head Davidson claims the union will stay out "as long as it takes Mr. Mackasey to realise we are in earnest." Post Office officials continue their hard-line stance; Mackasey has announced that he will not budge from the offer of a \$1.75 increase, even if postal workers were to strike for "three years." In Montreal, the CUPW is permitting the Letter Carriers Union of Canada (LCUC, the outside postal workers) to cross picket lines to deliver mail! A united and militant postal strike could well spearhead a major national counter-offensive against Trudeau's anti-labor wage-control program. Not sellout bureaucratic scabbing agreements, but a national strike of all postal workers!

Vient de paraître

SPARTACIST

édition française No. 10
octobre 1975

3,00 F. \$.75 US/Canada

pour toute commande s'adresser à:

Spartacist Publishing Co.
Box 1377 GPO,
New York, N.Y. 10001, USA

WORKERS VANGUARD

Strike Against Wage Controls!

Trudeau Slaps Wage Strait Jacket on Canadian Labor

TORONTO, October 18—Two weeks ago British Columbia provincial premier Dave Barrett and his New Democratic Party (NDP) government set the tone for hard-line anti-labor policies in Canada by ordering 50,000 striking forest workers back to work. Less than a week later, on the eve of a threatened national postal strike, federal Liberal Party prime minister Pierre Trudeau followed suit by introducing a new economic program amounting to a frontal attack on the living standards and purchasing power of the working class.

On October 13 Trudeau sat down to Thanksgiving dinner with Barrett, the other provincial premiers and federal opposition leaders to unveil a long-expected, sweeping program of wage and price controls. Receiving broad support from most of the assembled dignitaries (including, albeit with "reservations," from the three NDP provincial premiers), Trudeau went on television that evening to publicly present what he called a "program of restraint [which] is the heaviest imposed on Canadians since the Second World War." Even the bourgeois press was quick to admit that the so-called "price controls" were basically ineffectual, and that the new government policy is directed primarily against the wage demands of organized labor.

The mandatory guidelines establish maximum allowable wage increases of 10 percent for the next year, with 8 percent and 6 percent respectively for the subsequent two years. Included are all government workers and workers in companies with more than 500 employees, plus all construction workers in bargaining units of more than 20. However, workers in other categories are "expected" to comply with the legislation, which may be expanded by cabinet order to apply to "groups deemed to be of 'strategic importance' to Canada." Violators of the wage-control "guidelines" are to be investigated by an Anti-Inflation Board headed by former cabinet minister Jean-Luc Petin (Liberal) and armed with a staff of 200. Those refusing to comply are subject to jail sentences of up to five years and fines of up to \$10,000 or more.

Controversy Over Wage Controls

For the last year and a half—ever since the effects of the international capitalist economic crisis began to be seriously felt in Canada—various wings of the bourgeoisie have been arguing over the best means to restore the country's diminishing competitive power on the world market and place the burden of recession effects on the back of the working class. At the time of the June 1974 federal elections, the dominant capitalist interests preferred to ride out the recession, fearing the political consequences of unpopular wage controls. Trudeau's Liberal Party was re-elected with a solid majority on a program against wage and

price controls, while Robert Stanfield's Progressive Conservatives were rebuffed along with their call for immediate mandatory pay guidelines.

By earlier this year, however, it had become clear that there would be no early upturn in the economy while, to the government's particular disquiet, negotiated wage settlements were beginning to run much higher than in the United States. In the last quarter of 1974 the average annual pay increase in major Canadian union contracts was 14 percent annually and rising, while American labor bureaucrats had managed to keep the U.S. figure down to 5.9 percent despite approximately equal rates of inflation. Moreover, international comparisons showed that Canada had the highest per capita number of man-days lost through strike action of any major industrial country save Italy.

In March the federal government fired its opening salvo of an escalated war against the unions by passing emergency legislation to smash the strike of 3,500 West Coast ILWU dockers. Not unexpectedly, the social-democratic NDP supported the legislation. Soon after, federal finance minister John Turner announced a government policy of voluntary restraints, which was rejected by the leaders of the Canadian Labor Congress (CLC). However, the "militant"-posturing CLC tops were equally worried about growing combativity among the ranks and the following month agreed to serve on a class-collaborationist tripartite Labor Relations Council bringing together union, management and government representatives to find ways of reducing "labor strife."

Trudeau Strikes at Labor

After inflation and wage-increase statistics for the second quarter of 1975 showed no letup—the average annual wage hike hit almost 19 percent while comparable U.S. figures hovered below 10 percent—bourgeois public opinion began to swing heavily toward mandatory controls. Joining several leading capitalist newspapers, economists and industrialists in the call for a pay-increase ceiling were the social democrats Allan Blakeney and Ed Schreyer (NDP premiers of Saskatchewan and Manitoba), along with (at one point) federal party leader Ed Broadbent. In Ottawa, Turner resigned his finance portfolio in early September when the cabinet voted down controls.

One month later Trudeau was ready to slap on the wage strait jacket. Provincial governments in Quebec and British Columbia, the two main hotbeds of labor militancy, had broken the backs of militant strikes. The Liberal Quebec government passed special back-to-work legislation to end a Montreal transit strike in mid-September, and in B.C. only three NDP backbenchers voted against



Transit workers march through Montreal during strike in June.

Barrett's strikebreaking decree. In both cases the union bureaucracy put up a brief show of verbal bluster and then gave in without a fight.

Now this pattern is being repeated once again. Following announcement of a cabinet "White Paper" outlining the proposed "wage/price" controls, CLC leaders issued a "protest" couched in the immanently "reasonable" language befitting senior labor statesmen. While decrying the "inequities" of this particular program of restraint, the labor federation brief affirmed the bureaucrats' willingness to work with government and management "to develop a program to control inflation." CLC president Joe Morris and eight other union leaders continue to sit on the Labor Relations Council, and no effort has been made to mobilize the ranks against the government attacks. (Although B.C. premier Barrett has since demagogically come out against Trudeau's program, the NDP is committed, like the CLC, to negotiating a

compromise plan.)

Canadian workers stand today before a situation fraught with possibilities for a successful labor counteroffensive against a government which is demonstrating ever more clearly its union-busting intentions. Yet not one major labor leader (including the "anti-capitalist" Quebec bureaucrats who sit on a provincial labor board with government and management) has called for generalized defiance of the "guidelines" backed up by massive defensive strike action against government attempts to force their implementation. It is the NDP and CLC misleaders who are the major roadblock to successful labor action to smash Trudeau's austerity program.

CUPW Leaders Prepare to Sell Out Postal Workers

The best hope of scuttling the Liberals' wage-cutting policies is for militant strike

continued on page 11