Free South African Black Leader!

**Nelson Mandela Defiant**

For 22 years, Nelson Mandela has been a prisoner in a country that is a prison for its black majority. The 60-year-old Mandela is head of the long-banned African National Congress (ANC) and the most respected black leader in apartheid South Africa. His jailer, President P.W. Botha, heads a powerful white supremacist police state. But that state has been shaken by mass revolt, and now it is the jailer who is looking for a way out. At the end of January, Botha announced that he would consider releasing Mandela if the ANC leader would renounce “violence,” namely the campaign of sabotage and guerrilla attacks against military targets—this from a government which has slaughtered over 150 blacks in the last year alone!

Mandela has lost none of the dignity and courage he showed in the dock in the early 1960s. In a defiant statement read by his daughter Zini to a crowd of 9,000 in Soweto he declared, referring to Botha:

“Let him renounce violence. Let him see that he will dismantle apartheid. Let him unban the people’s organization, the African National Congress.”

Let him free all who have been imprisoned, banished or exiled for their opposition to apartheid. Let him guarantee free political activity so that the people may decide who will govern them... I cannot sell my birthright nor am I prepared to sell the birthright of the people to be free.”

— New York Times,
31 January

And in an interview with Britain’s Lord Bethell (January) (clearly granted to set the stage for Botha’s “offer”), Mandela reaffirmed the obvious fact that the armed struggle had been forced on South Africa’s blacks by the British capitalism is in deep trouble. After six years of Thatcherite austerity, five million are chronically unemployed, factories are folding and the country’s problems is about to meet the Daily Mirror’s headline: “Iron Lady should swing.”

**Thatcher and Reagan:**

Enemies of the People

Margaret Thatcher is coming to Washington leaving a trail of blood behind her. This is the “Iron Lady,” the British prime minister who sent 368 Argentine sailors to a watery grave for the sheer pleasure of it, who presides over the daily terrorist slaughter of the Irish people, and who this very minute is sending out waves of cops to batter-and-smash the British coal miners’ eleven-month-old strike. Now she comes to meet Evil Emperor Reagan, who destroyed the air traffic controllers union and invaded black Grenada, as he initiates his second term of bleeding the working class, the poor and minorities for the workers and oppressed of the world.

British capitalism is in deep trouble. After six years of Thatcherite austerity, five million are chronically unemployed, factories are folding and the once-mighty pound sterling is almost at parity with the dollar. Thatcher is playing out her sagging fortunes.

**Butcher of the Belgrano Meets Grenada Invader**

**Murder Most Foul**

From El Salvador to South Africa to Thatcher’s Britain, Ronald Reagan’s ‘Free World’ is marked by bloody repression. For over two years now Thatcher has been dogged by the ghosts of the hundreds of Argentine sailors who died when their cruiser, the General Belgrano, was sunk by Thatcher’s navy in 1982 during the Falklands/Malvinas war, that bizarre conflict between two reactionary capitalist regimes. When numerous “leaks” about this affair started coming out in early 1984, we concluded that “If Thatcher dispatched those Argentine boys to the bottom of the sea, she richly deserves hanging.” (WV No. 353, 27 April 1984). Now the published facts are overwhelming: the Iron Lady should swing.

During and after the Falklands/ Malvinas conflict, British officials had bragged to the world that their navy operated under strict civilian-issued “Rules of Engagement” in the undeclared war—“minimum force” and “a civilized code of conduct” were the keynotes according to Commander Christopher Craig, commanding officer of the HMS Ajax, writing in the U.S. Naval War College Review (May-June 1984). Much ado was made of the British announcement of a Total Exclusion Zone around the islands—a zone within which Argentine naval vessels continued on page 9.
For Agrarian Revolution in South Africa!

Revenge of the P&FP

Jan Norden, editor Workers Vanguard
Socialist salutations:
Your 25 January 1985 article on the declining influence of the Internationalist Worker Party (IWP) made interesting reading, but contained several inaccuracies. Most important is your characterization of the California Peace and Freedom Party (PFP) as a “Short-lived expression of middle-class politics” which you admit is based on the cursed notions of Spartacist comrades from SEVENTEEN YEARS AGO. No mention is made of the PFP Platform (which the IWP ignored to promote their liberal reformist candidates). It addresses, in direct contradiction to #1’s mistaken assertions, the capitalist character of war, racism, sexism, and economic exploitation. The PFP Platform states: “Socialism can only be brought about if we working class people unite and act as a body in our own interests. This means that our goals cannot be achieved by electoral means alone. We favor mass organization and direct action in the community, the workplace, and the armed forces to fight for democracy at all levels of social organization everywhere in the world.”

SCULPT (the Search Committee for a United Left Presidential Ticket) was initiated not by the IWP in April 1983 as you reported, but by independents within PFP in December 1982. Its conferences attracted participation by activists representing a dozen parties and numerous other organizations on the Left. You are correct in quoting the IWP from SCULPT’S address: “We are the same PFP address which was formerly shared by the Socialist Party of Los Angeles; however this provides no justification for the IWP posturing as a self-styled “East Coast Committee for a Peace and Freedom Party National Slate in 1984” any more than if it had posed as a “Provisional Committee for an Authentic Spartacist League.” You are incorrect in identifying Casey Peters as a member of the Socialist Party, which I am not.

Despite your steadfast denunciation of the IWP, you like to quote them as a reliable source when it suits your argument. We’re rather remote from your mired in your left anarchist frame of mind and can be distinguished together with all its effects on health, etc., only if the whole social order from which it sprang is fundamentally refashioned.

—Frederick Engels, The Housing Question (1872)
Launching Pad for U.S. Aggression in Central America

Militarism and Repression in Puerto Rico

Excusing U.S. military activity, witchhunts against leftists, heavy repression against labor. Economic collapse: factories closing, mass layoffs, more than 3 years of official unemployment. Some Latin American banana republics? No, this is Puerto Rico, the U.S. island empire, considered a showcase of democracy and development in the Caribbean. Today it's an economic disaster area and political powder keg.

Puerto Rico has entered a period of internationalization directly linked to the fiscal crisis of American imperialism, the anti-Soviet war drive and U.S. intervention against revolutionary struggles in Central America. The bankruptcy of the colonial parties couldn't be clearer: the phony “commonwealth” status has long since lost its attraction and statehood is manifestly unreal. Yet the pachucos, normally on the losing end, have been given a chance to prevail, and for obvious reasons. The Puerto Rican masses are hardly in the position of independence under capitalism as they watch hunger riots next door in Jamaica and the Dominican Republic. A genuine independence from colonial rule and liberation from neocolonial domination requires political revolution throughout the region. What's needed is internationalist class struggle against Yankee imperialism in the Caribbean, Central America and North America itself.

San Juan, August 1965. Grenada, 1983. Nicaragua 1985? Puerto Rico has repeatedly served as a staging ground for U.S. aggression in Central America. Now Reagan has turned the island into a giant military base for the counterrevolutionary war he is waging in Central America. Squadrons of attack and surveillance planes have been moved in; the FBI's Fugitive Task Force has set up shop in a giant Roosevelt Roads naval base. The Puerto Rican National Guard includes a battalion of airborne paratroopers and an amphibious assault unit, all part of the Rapid Deployment Force which served as a staging ground in the invasion of Grenada in October 1983. And since December hundreds of Puerto Rican Guardsmen have been in Panama for six-month-long “counter-insurgency” maneuvers, making them available for the same Salvadoran leftist rebels or Sandinista Nicaragua. Thus independence for Puerto Rico is intimately linked with the struggle for revolution in Central America.

Meanwhile, mirrored in the worst economic crisis since the 30s, Puerto Rico today has 62 percent of the population living below the federal poverty level. Most of the families are dependent on food stamps; a third of all able-bodied adult men have no full-time job. City and state welfare programs pay for the multi-trillion-dollar military buildup that has devastated the island's economy, which derives nearly a third of its gross product from U.S. government payments. In his first year alone, Reagan slashed nearly half a billion dollars in federal aid to Puerto Rican government budget. And now the Reaganite free marketers are eliminating thousands of jobs with their plans for a Caribbean “co-prosperity sphere” by eliminating tariffs on their coloony in 1980. Two investigations, “Macheteros” guerrilla unit, has been fighting an insurgency war for independence from Yankee imperialism in the Caribbean since 1976. A federal trial of ten Nelson Mandela in 1978. At the time the police were praised by Governor Romero Barceló as “heroic.” Two investigations have revealed new facts about the administration of Governor Kenneth Keating, the corporate consultant who served three terms as governor under the last administration.

Police terrorize squatters at Villa Sin Miedo, burning houses to the ground, May 1982.

for their necrolegones—the one advantage Puerto Rico had as a low-wage haven for runaway shops. Whatever the island's colonial “status,” its economic future under U.S. rule is one of increasing misery.

As Puerto Rico becomes increasingly militarized, as it sinks deeper into economic depression, political repression has kept pace. And the repressive forces act just like what they are: mercenaries in the service of a foreign oppressor. The National Guard are not weekend warriors but a colonial police force, routinely used to smash striking workers and students. The police revel in violence and provocation such as the cold-blooded execution of two young independentistas at Cerro Maravilla in 1978. A federal trial of ten policemen charged with violating a grand jury's order to testify was dropped by a barrage of violence, then beaten and forcibly deported while on their knees begging for mercy. These cold-blooded murders were only the most blatant in a series of police assaults on Puerto Rican police and death squad attacks on oppositionists in Puerto Rico. In 1976, the son of independence leader Juan Mari Bras was kidnapped and assassinated under suspicious circumstances. That same year a leader of the left wing of the Popular Republican Party, Juan Rafael Caballero, was seized and murdered by the police. Other unionists have been victims of frame-ups designed to put them out of commission: Arturo Grant of the Movimiento Obrero Unido, jumped on murder charges; Norberto Cintron, framed for bank robbery; Radames Acosta, head of the Union Nacional de Trabajadores, jailed on trumped-up charges. More recently, the notorious ex-police chief and reputedly headed by former Colonel Alejandro Maldonado (arrested in 1982 for kidnapping and murder), has been fighting a gang war to the death with organized crime—as well as beating and intimidating witnesses to police corruption.

When things get out of hand they bring in the military police. In 1978 Romero used several acts of sabotage at the Puerto Rican electric company (committed by the same González Malave) as an excuse for continued on page 5
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TROTSKYIST LEAGUE OF CANADA
Aid to Striking British Miners’ Families

Accounting of Receipts Nos. 1-175

Contributors received numbers, receipts, and the financial records of the fund drive are open to inspection by any bona fide workers’ organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collected in Last Two Weeks: Trade cards</th>
<th>$500.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union Membership Collections</td>
<td>463.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Donations</td>
<td>1,542.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,145.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Previously Reported</td>
<td>$14,349.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Collected (as of 20 February 1985)</td>
<td>$16,905.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Sent to Miners’ Solidarity Fund (as of 20 February 1985)</td>
<td>$16,905.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount on Deposit (as of 20 February 1985)</td>
<td>$2,364.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To mobilize for the fund drive in your area, write to: Partisan Defense Committee, Box 99, Post Office Station, New York, NY 10013. Make checks payable to: Aid to Striking British Miners’ Families.
Puerto Rico...

(continued from page 3)

strong-arm measures against militant strikers of the independent UITER in its police SWAT units. The rioted against striking students protest­

ing tuition hikes at the University of Puerto Rico. The police, in turn, rioted against campus protesters; some armed with M-16 automatic rifles, evicted squatters at Villa Sin Huesos, burned the homes of those resisting eviction, and arrested students.

And for recalcitrant militants there is always the device of a federal grand jury: the one who is caught for defying contempt of court, on indefini­
test sentences which could go up to 15 years behind bars. Lawyers for independistas Federico Cintrón and Carlos Noya were sentenced to two years in jail and talked to a walk-out of ger­

eral federal grand jury in Brooklyn. As the newspaper of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, Claridad (28 October - 3 November 1983), commented, a year earlier "New American authorities in Puerto Rico have stepped up their offensive against organized crime, governmental corruption and 'terrorism.' They have now realized the importance of convictions against various figures of organized crime, and governmental corruption... these convictions... are similar to the third ingredient, that is, to produce an important case related to 'terrorism.'

The federal trial of ten ex-cops implicated in the Cerro Maravilla assassinations is hardly justify. They are charged only with perjury—no date has yet been set for a murder trial—and anyone favoring independence is being excluded from the jury (along with those who do not have sufficient knowledge of the English language). No attempt has been made to indict those that ordered the executions which, according to testimony last December, in­clude an adviser of ex-governor Romero Barceló. And no serious investigation has been made of the third ingredient, killed and its role in the cover-up.

Governor Hernández Colón owes his election in large part to outrage against Romero's involvement in Cerro Maravilla. But it was during Hernández Colón's last administration that the National Guard was used against the student demonstrations in 1973 (a UTER strike) for the first time since the 1950 Nationalist uprising. Whether admin­istrator of the Foreign Service, "commonwealth" puppets, savage re­
pression is a constant in the Yankee imperialist agenda. Defense of democracy must demand: FBI, CIA out of Puerto Rico! Free all fighters against Yankee imperialism! Release the victims of grand jury frame-ups!

Military Bastion of Yankee Imperialism

Puerto Rico has always been seen by the United States as a military strong point to control the strategic region. (The Spaniards before them had the same idea, witness the powerful guns and fortifications overlooking San Juan harbor.) Today as the Reaganites proclaim the Caribbean mare nostrum, "the American lake" as Ted Kennedy called it, threatening "Star Wars" against the Russians over a mythical Soviet menace to vital sea lanes, Puerto Rico's strategic importance has grown. In 1962 UN ambassador Jean Kirk­patrick told the United Nations of July of garrison statehood in San Juan that the island was a geopolitical, military­

alliance area for Washington and U.S. and therefore "not negotiable." And recent news reports reveal Pentagon plans to store­

jolt, military expenditures in Puerto Rico has been beefed up to serve as a sin­

inexpensive expeditionary force for use in Latin America. (According to Commo­
dore Diego Hernández, commander of key role as training center, weapons

warehouse and refueling base. While the military has long used the island of Vieques for bombing target practice, for the Reagan administration the U.S.

Caribbean colony is key because of its location. Last April 1980, Roosevelt Roads, the largest military recruiting base in Puerto Rico...

Nationalist guerrillas strike at Muñiz Air National Guard Base, a staging area for U.S. militarism in the Caribbean.

U.S. naval forces in the Caribbean. U.S. military recruiters get an advertisement of反射 (for every Hispanic signed up.) Last spring some 500 Puerto Rican National Guard soldiers participated in the U.S.' Big Pine II maneuvers in Honduras. And in April 1.000 Guards­

men participated in a mock assault on Vieques together with the 82d Air­

borne Division, as part of the "Ocean Venture "94 exercises. Puerto Rican Jews have also been used as CIA operatives working with the Nicaraguan counter­

revolutionary mercenaries. As proved by the death of Guardsman Héctor Luis J. Torres on a mission with Edén Pastora's "contras.

During Nicaragua's MIG holocaust last November, there was an atmosphere of panic in the armed forces in Puerto Rico. Then in December several units of the National Guard shipped out to Panama where they have been participating in the Minuteman II exercises, supposedly limited to "road maintenance." These are to be followed by the Kindle Liberty '85 counterin­

vasion exercises in early February, 1985. The Puerto Rican troops are scheduled to remain in Central America through May. This would make them available for the Big Pine III maneuvers which began February 11, involving several thousand U.S. troops onboard and a major army/tank/exercise in an area with the smallest U.S.-occupied border and equidistant from Salvador­

an areas under the control of leftist guerrillas.

This massive militarization of Puerto Rico provoked a march of thousands of Puerto Ricans on April 29 demanding, the case of the PIP's co-thinkers in the Second International is a stab in the back against the Central American revolution. Any partisan of Puerto Rican independence should understand—

ly understand that freedom (from the chains of colonial rule) only come about through the defeat of Yankee imperialism. They should call on Puerto Rican National Guard units to refuse to embark for Central America and once there to turn their guns against the Yankee aggressors. If the draft is

whither China?

Deng proposes to quadruple national output by the year 2000, in just four years—through rural reform, foreign trade, and an "open door" to the imperialist West. If this is achieved, declares Deng, "China's international influence will also be quite different, and our economic power will be quite strong." Deng's promised economic miracle is no less illusionary than Mao's. If Deng succeeds, it emerged from the civil war and revolution of the 1940s was extremely poor and backward compared even to the early Soviet Union. Russia in the 1920s produced roughly twice as much food per capita as did China in the early 1950s. Stalin was able to push through a massive industrialization program in the 1930s, but at the cost of cutting the consumption levels of both the workers and peasants. Mao's China was shaky from the margin of starvation to Stalin's Russia in this regard. The attempt to do this in China is an immediate run up against severe food shortages.

Mao's response was the impecunious economic development of the Great Leap Forward. "Communism" was to be built practically overnight through the largesse of peasants and the naivete of Beijing's planners as well as the exploitation of the people. It will take a lot more than People's Daily editorializing that Marx is outdated, rich peasants are necessary, and the open market and factory managers are necessary in the Chinese economy and why? Let's set this question in historical context. For thousands of years imperial China (the Middle Kingdom) was a great and powerful country. In the 19th century, the authorities of the Communist State was in a deformed communist state. The Chinese workers state has been outlawing China. They think they're communist—but they're not.

From Mao's Great Leap Forward...

What is actually happening to the Chinese economy and why? Let's set this question in historical context. For thousands of years imperial China (the Middle Kingdom) was a great and powerful country. In the 19th century, the authorities of the Communist State was in a deformed communist state. The Chinese workers state has been outlawing China. They think they're communist—but they're not.
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original New Economic Policy put forward by Lenin in 1921 as a necessary but temporary retreat, and what it became under the Stalin/Bukharin bloc in the mid-late 1930s where Russia’s peasants were told to “enrich yourselves.” Interestingly, Zogoria notes that the Chinese have recently translated Stephen Cohen’s sympathetic biography of Nikolai Bukharin. Like Buk­harin, the Deng regime is trying to coax China’s peasants to “enrich yourselves.”

Although the communes with their three-tiered structure still formally exist in China, the basic unit of production, accounting and distribution is today the individual peasant household. An official of the state procurement agency indicated that it no longer deals with 5.5 million production teams as before but with 170 million separate peasant households. Chinese Stalinism has turned the landlord system on its head. Such policies have helped to speed up the very beginnings of agricultural collectivization. Under the “responsibility system” peasant households lease a plot of land for 15 years. In return they are obliged to pay the state with an annual sum of produce at a fixed price. Anything over and above that amount can be sold to the state at a higher price or on the open market. In addition, the size of private plots has been doubled, and peasants are encouraged to engage in all kinds of sideline occupations (handicraft production, freelance construction work, trucking, etc.). The Chinese countryside has experienced an explosion of petty capitalism. Small-scale entrepreneurs are also flourishing in the cities.

When Reagan visited China last spring, he praised the “free-market spirit,” which, he claimed, “has already enriched the Chinese economy.” Prop­agandists for the Deng regime and its friends on Wall Street and in Washing­ton have trumpeted the rise from 3.5 to 7 percent (the late 50s to early 30s year) since the new policies were introduced in late 1978. To begin with, much of this increase is due to substantial agricultural invest­ment before Deng’s NEP. Despite the disruptions of the Cultural Revolution, between 1965 and 1977 production of farm machinery increased eightfold, the supply of fertilizer (double over the preceding 35 years) doubled. In part Deng is reaping the crop sown by the now-willed Mao regime.

More fundamentally, it is impossible to judge the benefits of the agricultural “green revolution” in China without some knowledge of how the distribution of income has become so grossly inequal­itarian. The Chinese press regularly reports that the doubling (1.3 fold in a year, 20 to 30 times the average national per capita income! The Wall Street Journal (4 May 1984) gives us a capsule portrait of one of China’s new “10,000­yuanaires.” a chicken farmer named Wu Xiangin. Wu has purchased a new house, a new chicken coop and a TV set. He plans to diversify into raising rabbits, ducks and geese because this is more lucrative. Wu’s neighbor, Li Xiaoquan, the Journal describes as “a disreputable man who lives in a cramped and dirty house. Mr. Li has only four pigs, six chickens and a family income about one-tenth of Mr. Wu’s.”

The likes of chicken farmer Wu may be heroes of entrepreneurial capitalism to the Wall Street Journal, but they are very different to their very different neighbors like Li. China’s newly rich peasants complain constantly that people are stealing their livestock, construction materials, even crops in the field. One poor peasant woman poisioned the ducks of her too conspicuous­ly prosperous neighbor. The Ministry of Public Security has issued a nationwide directive instructing police to protect the property of the newly rich against communist from below. Business Week (14 January) reports in a worried tone:

“Some poor peasants have attacked or sabotaged their better-off neighbors. By creating pockets of wealth, Deng may be setting the stage for a new outbreak of class struggle.”

He may indeed.

The Old Plagues Return

The “free-market spirit,” so praised by Reagan and the Wall Street Journal, has not only produced gross inequality but has had other reactionary, even barbaric, effects. It has, for example, contributed to the reappearance of female infanticide in the Chinese coun­tryside. With the breakdown of collective agriculture and de facto restora­tion of family farming, peasant couples are more determined than ever to have at least one male heir to provide for them in old age. There are no state provisions for China’s peasantry, and daughters traditionally move into their husband’s household. Since the regime applies strong economic incentives and penalties to encourage one-child fami­lies to keep down the population, some peasants kill their girl babies to insure themselves of a son and provider.

Between 1979 and 1983 agricultural procurement prices were increased almost 50 percent, while labor produc­tivity on the farms rose only about 10 percent. How come China has not then experienced an explosion in food prices? In fact, consumer goods prices have been rising since 1980 but at nothing like the runaway pace of peasant money income. Inflation is potential social dynamite in China where memories of the civil war in the 1940s, when currency became completely worthless, are still very much alive. About a year ago the Wall Street Journal (27 December 1983) noted: “Many of the old guard in China’s leadership remember that the rival Kuomintang’s loss of power in the late 1940s was accelerated by a wave of hyperinflation. They don’t want that to happen to them.”

To prevent the money being showered over the countryside from spilling over into rapidly rising food prices, the Deng regime has resorted to ever­greater subsidies from the state budget. Last year agricultural subsidies ate up, so to speak, one quarter of all government expenditure. Referring to China’s agricultural boom, “the Far Eastern Econom­ic Review’s 1984 Asia Yearbook pointed out “the price of these achievements has been costly subsidies for agricultural products which have strained govern­ment revenues that are needed for major investments in education, health and transporta­tion infrastructures and for government services.” But Deng & Co. cannot forestall or even forestall the feather from Peter to pay Paul. Last summer premier Zhao Ziyang reportedly ex­plained: “The government can’t go on like this indefinitely.”

The much ballyhooed economic “re­form” announced in late 1979 was basically a decision to bite the bullet of inflation. The day after the “reform” was announced, the regime in Beijing stripped the shops of everything they could buy and store. The commercially minded citizens of the new peasantry from that island of entrepreneurial capital­ism, Hong Kong, preferred to invest their yuan in jewelry. They knew what was coming.

Deng’s “building socialism with capital­ist market mechanisms” has failed on its return not only of the old plague inflation but another one, unemployment. To increase labor productivity in industry, the regime is seeking to break the “iron rice bowl,” a policy that is guaranteed job. Taking the lead are the foreign-owed concessions and joint ventures, whose brief is “to open the door.”

For example, just before the Chinese New Year last February the president of Fung Brothers Ltd. wished his 600 workers a happy new year and then told 100 of them that they were being laid off. An estimated 10 percent of the urban population are today unemployed and reduced to survival. In rural China, the farm­ers are more determined than ever to have at least one male heir to provide for them in old age. There are no state provisions for China’s peasantry, and daughters traditionally move into their husband’s household. Since the regime applies strong economic incentives and penalties to encourage one-child fami­lies to keep down the population, some peasants kill their girl babies to insure themselves of a son and provider.

Where Is Deng’s China Going?

China’s much publicized agricultural boom is superficial and transient. On the one hand, it is based on massive government subsidies at the cost of investment needed for other sectors and, in any case, cannot continue on the present scale. On the other hand, China’s newly rich peasants are not reinvesting their wealth to improve agricultural productivity. “Peasants have so far tended to use most of their windfalls to build houses; relatively little has been invested in farming equipment or improving fields” (Far Eastern Eco­nomic Review, Asia Yearbook, 1984). Why is this?

For one thing, the rich peasants do not trust the Peking bureaucrats, whom they promises they will not take away their wealth or a good part of it. Like the Russian kulaks (rich peasants) under
The rise of protectionism in the West poses a direct attack on one of the basic foundations of the Chinese Revolution: "land to the tiller." The need is to bring down the whole racist, apartheid, capitalist system where it is the job of the state power to defend the interests of two fundamentally hostile social classes. Even more than the present "rich peasant" policy, the incorporation of Hong Kong's wealthy and self-confident bourgeoisie into the People's Republic would enormously strengthen the forces for counterrevolution.

Deng's "building socialism with capitalist methods" encourages class consciousness, to societal class consciousness. As an example of Poland demonstrates how conciliation of petty-bourgeois layers, with their剩余 resources-available to maintain the capitalist system, is a great task for the international proletarian revolution and global socialist order.

NYC Cops... (continued from page 12)

Nazi stormtroopers. This was a naked show of force to threaten unbridled, murderous police terror.

A New York Times (6 February) editorial warned that to give in to the cops', threats was to "invite insurrection." The haughty organ of the bourgeois establishment is worried that Soviet system as a whole give to the give up their guns to Chiang Kai-shek, leading to bloody counterrevolution. Among workers seize Shanghai in 1927. Stalin told revolutionary workers to give themselves an "open door" to foreign multinational enterprises, leading to bloody counterrevolution.


When "subway vigilante" Bernard Goetz shot four black youth who were trying to rip him off, Koch used the incident to fan the flames of racism. Last week he praised Manhattan DA Robert Morgenthau's grand jury for dropping the charges against Goetz—except for the "crime" of carrying a gun—then he denounced Merola's grand jury for charging Sullivan, who is guilty of murder, with anything at all! Koch answered the Times with a letter defending Sullivan and the cops' mob action at the Bronx courthouse, while denouncing the "unlawful" transit workers strike in 1980 which, both he and the Times editors agreed, had to be broken.

According to police "union" head Caruso, Sullivan "only did his job." For once, Caruso's not lying. As Eleanor Bumpurs' daughter Mary put it, "they all have blood on their hands," "What we need is to bring down the whole racist, capitalist system where it is the job of the cops to bust strikers' heads and police the ghetto through naked terror. Put killer cop Sullivan behind bars! Abolish the ESU! Smash police bonapartism!"

Armed workers seize Shanghai in 1927. Stalin told revolutionary workers to give themselves an "open door" to foreign multinational enterprises, leading to bloody counterrevolution.

Mandela... (continued from page 1)

maneuvering to place on Mandela the responsibility for his continued imprisonment. This move comes amid what one observer calls South Africa’s Afrikaner Nationalists, unemployed to the ANC: foreign minister Pik Botha said last November that the ANC might one day be legalized if it “renounced violence,” of course; a journalist then wrote “red-baiting” in Afrikaans newspaper met with ANC officials in exile; and P.W. Botha had to deny reports that the ANC planned to of parliament had done likewise. In a parallel move, business associations represented by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of South Africa’s commercial and industry came out with a memorandum calling for an end to the ANC’s boycotts of corporate business opportunities and for “free” trade unions, common South African citizenship. Citizenship was denied to the citizenship in the poverty-stricken bantustans and “meaningful political participation” for the African majority.

Ten years ago one could talk about the ANC only in deep secrecy and all this is unable to the ANC. It is heard only from the most far-sighted English-speaking capitalists such as Halford James, a member of the American conglomerate. So why the change? In part because economic policy is increasingly being dominated by the IMF and the World Bank, the economy is now stagnant, dogged by rising unemployment, and provisions for the poor, such as short of funds, which requires the formation of a stable layer of petty bourgeoisie, and the growing number of the ANC, the ANC has committed itself to the program of apartheid. This program has been criticized by many as a warmed-over version of the Homestead Act carried out in the name of the ANC. The ANC’s strategy of violent resistance is far from its “tribal homelands.” In other words, the ANC leadership welcomed Kennedy’s “legalization” of apartheid as an opportunity to refocus the ANC’s strategy of violent resistance.

To understand the ANC’s strategy of violent resistance, one must look at the structural contradictions within South Africa. The ANC is a black liberation movement, which means that it is not only a warmed-over version of the Homestead Act, but also a reaction against the capitalist system. The ANC is a movement of the black majority of South Africa, which seeks to overthrow the capitalist system and establish a socialist society. The ANC is a movement that is not only about freedom from apartheid, but also about freedom from capitalism.

In terms of the rural black immiserated population, hunger is not only about food. They (or their fathers or grandfathers) have possibly never seen, let alone work with, a plow. They are thus inadequately equipped to express this but have not as yet on anything that seems to do the job. Perhaps something like the Homestead Act carried out in the context of a rural uprising in the period of dual power in South Africa (or afterwards) would best fit the bill. Comrade Ed.

Wife replies: “The land worked by South Africa’s black peasantry is not at all, as comrades claim, free from the to desolate bantustan hellholes. Agriculture is important in the economy of the apartheid state, and this is why 10 percent of its exports. The producers of this agricultural work, the “tillers of South Africa’s rich, white-owned soil, are overwhelmingly black African workers. This is why the ANC leadership welcomed Kennedy’s “legalization” of apartheid as an opportunity to refocus the ANC’s strategy of violent resistance. This is why the ANC leadership welcomed Kennedy’s “legalization” of apartheid as an opportunity to refocus the ANC’s strategy of violent resistance.

In the terms of the rural black immiserated population, hunger is not only about food. They (or their fathers or grandfathers) have possibly never seen, let alone work with, a plow. They are thus inadequately equipped to express this but have not as yet on anything that seems to do the job. Perhaps something like the Homestead Act carried out in the context of a rural uprising in the period of dual power in South Africa (or afterwards) would best fit the bill. Comrade Ed. C.

Wife replies: “The land worked by South Africa’s black peasantry is not at all, as comrades claim, free from the to desolate bantustan hellholes. Agriculture is important in the economy of the apartheid state, and this is why 10 percent of its exports. The producers of this agricultural work, the “tillers of South Africa’s rich, white-owned soil, are overwhelmingly black African workers. This is why the ANC leadership welcomed Kennedy’s “legalization” of apartheid as an opportunity to refocus the ANC’s strategy of violent resistance. This is why the ANC leadership welcomed Kennedy’s “legalization” of apartheid as an opportunity to refocus the ANC’s strategy of violent resistance.
NYC Housing...

(continued from page 12)

Of course, not everybody’s got this problem. The Times (21 January) “Home” section recently featured the lifestyle of sculptor Donald Judd in “SoHo’s Wide-Open Spaces.” Judd bought a small five-story office building in southern Manhattan, a former garment factory, and converted it into his home. On the ground floor he exhibits his sculpture, the second floor is his living room, the third his studio. On the fourth floor he has a dining room table, on the fifth a bed. In the basement he has bedrooms for his two teen-age kids, and he’s remodeling the subbasement as a dance and performance area. Judd said he hates “clutter”: “I don’t know why people live in SoHo lots if they want to divide these spaces into apartments.” The Times wisely didn’t publish the address of this conspicuous housing consumer—he might have some unwanted space invaders subdividing his wide-open spread!

On the other side of the coin unaffordable luxury condominiums is absolute misery. The day after its housing survey, the Times ran a letter to the editor quoting a police spokesman saying that crime usually goes down in freezing weather. The writer noted that what you see is a different kind of crime—landlords freezing people to death. “Hypothermia,” a fancy word invented in England, has now become a common statistic in New York. And a picture story. “They tried to turn off in the middle of a bedroom.” The Daily (22 February), showed a “family” of about 60 homeless men and women who have been living in an open shed on the Lower East Side for the last two years. Squatters in lean-tos, gathered around an old-drum fire for warmth, homeless huddled in Grand Central Station like shell-shocked war refugees: is this New York or the shantytowns of Santiago or the Bronx? “The writer noted that what you get is a different kind of crime—landlords freezing people to death.”

As every statistic shows, New York is becoming a city of the very rich and the very poor. And as the streets get meaner, Koch’s racist cocktails ride roughshod over everyone. If you live in a city housing project and fall behind $386 in rent, a police SWAT team may break in and blow you away, as they did to inform black grandmother Eleanor Bumpers in the Bronx. As Koch’s cronies in the old Brooklyn Democratic club whose tax write-offs, abatements, city contracts and special zoning arrangements made the Trump family king of the Hill in New York today.

What’s good for Donald Trump is good for New York, says Mayor Koch, whose campaigns have been financed by every real estate interest in the city. Trump’s first big real estate deal was the conversion of the nearly defunct Commodore Hotel into the chrome and glass luxury Grand Hyatt, made possible by a 40-year tax abatement from the city, the first ever granted to a commercial property. This little sweetheart deal was worked out during the mid-1970s bankengineered NYC “fiscal crunch.” When the economy picked up, Trump was sitting atop a gold mine. Now that the economy picked up, Trump was..., and in the art of “tenant removal”!

Harry Macklowe is to real estate what Ed Koch is to politics—a real wrecker. Everybody hates Harry, from the poor crammed into SRO hotels to the cultured elite of the bourgeoisie. We had some personal experience with this “exclusive real estate operator” when he bought the old American Thread Company building at 260 West Broadway a few years ago, where we had our party offices. Before this warehouse district below Canal Street became “tribebea.” Macklowe wanted to convert the third floor to lofts, and he is an expert in the art of “tenant removal”! in the dead of winter the heat “failed,” water was turned off in the toilets, the elevators stopped, locks were removed on building doors so that women were assaulted in the bathrooms. Now the building houses superheroes like Harry Belafonte’s daughter and rock singer Cyndi Lauper. Like Cyndi’s hit song says, “Money Changes Everything.”

“Gentrification”—Then and Now

Besides the giant condominiums going up in Midtown, there has also been the gentrification of the southern tip of Manhattan. The basis for transformation of the Soho/tribebea area was laid some 15 years ago when they moved the old produce district up to Hunt’s Point in the Bronx. This produced a deep depression in property values below Canal Street, but the stock of buildings has appreciated enormously. Pre-existing landlords are reaping enormous profits, the Mack­ lowes of Manhattan real estate are making a killing out of the move. Hong Kong and Taiwan is moving into Manhattan. And after Rockefeller Center to Lincoln Center, if there is one sinister force behind it all historically, it’s the Rockefeller family. The whole development is related to a fundamental restructuring of the American city called “gentrification.”

For decades the bourgeoisie has moved further and further out of town, so the run this country finally figured out that urban areas have enormous advantages. Why should we have to commute, they figure, let the damned masses make the long haul. Because life could be good in New York City. Here you have the center of culture, politics, finance, science, etc. If you really want to feed deer, you can go up to Westches­ ter and Putnam counties and get Lyme...
ticks, or even more horrible blights like Rocky Mountain spotted fever. But if you want amenities, the cities are where it’s at. So now billions of dollars are flowing into New York City as the bourgeoisie takes the urban centers which can be what suburbia and exurba never could be.

In the great cities of Europe this is very old news, centuries old. Paris was the model. With the onset of political reaction under Napoleon III, they ripped down the poor quarters which were the hotbeds of revolution. The narrow alleys whose cobblestone was used to build barricades were replaced by broad paved avenues—perfect for mounted troops to stamp out any disorder. And the poor were pushed out. Frederick Engels, Karl Marx’s closest collaborator, wrote in his 1872 pamphlet, The Housing Question:

“And it is just the same with the housing situation in the big cities as in the villages. The town planners think they have improved the situation by using highways and motorways, and an artificial and often colossal­ly increased value: the buildings erected on these areas depress this value, instead of increasing it, because they no longer correspond to the changed circumstances. They are pulled down and replaced by others. This takes place above all with workers’ homes which are situated centrally and which remain, even with the greatest overcrowding, closed up, or, only very slowly, increase above a certain maximum. They are pulled down and in their stead shops, warehouses and public buildings are erected.

Through its Haussmann. Bonapartism exploited this tendency tremendously for swindling and private profit. But then the whole of Haussmann has also been abandoned in London and Paris, and seems to feel itself just as much at home in Berlin and Vienna as it did in Paris. And the whole of Haussmann has also been abandoned in London and Paris, and seems to feel itself just as much at home in Berlin and Vienna as it did in Paris.

The inner city was for the grand bourgeoisie. The next belt was for the middle class, then the poor. Then way out were the masses, likely not to speak the same language or have the same customs; you can’t stay in the same working class to the lumpen bidonvilles or shantytowns. This pattern has come to the United States too—the slums in Pittsburgh, and now New York, New San Francisco, Boston. For your would-be Bonaparte? Mayor Koch or your Hausmanns are the Donald Trumps.

Urban Renewal = Negro Renewal
To “revoke” the cities, the bourgeoisie has to move out the poor, and that means overwhelmingly blacks and Hispanics. (Occasionally you hit a few blocks of Irish in the middle of a ghetto, but that’s rare these days.) This is why this whole process of gentrification is accompanied by the furor of racist backlash, from Koch’s killer cop cliché after black kids on the streets to his current “anti-crisis” campaign, calling for urban renewal to get rid of the slums.

Meanwhile his opponent, City Council President Karl Bellamy, is the very epitome of the thousands of “urban professionals” who during the 1980 transit strike put on sneakers and jogged over the Brooklyn Bridge each morning to work in Wall Street, giving rise to the phenomenon of the “yuppie.” Bellamy is a lawyer, but the chances are he’s happier as a yuppie than a lawyer.

The answer is: there is no answer. Blackness itself, for the bourgeoisie, is a plague, an evil, a sickness. If you are able to cross over it, to speak the same language, to have the same customs, to stay in the same working class to the lumpen bidonvilles or shantytowns. This pattern has come to the United States too—the slums in Pittsburgh, and now New York, New San Francisco, Boston. For your would-be Bonaparte? Mayor Koch or your Hausmanns are the Donald Trumps.

New York City homeless try to survive: living out of bags and seeking “shelter” in Central Park (left, dwellers of Central Park West have at least a home to go to now). So here we are in the financial capital of world capitalism, and we find an entire underground city—estimates run from 20,000 to 60,000—of homeless thrown out of mental hospitals and prisons. In the South Bronx, Mayor Koch added his usual grotesque touch by announcing with much fanfare plans to build ranch houses (!) on the site with federally subsidized mortgages. Today there are two (count ’em) model ranch houses on Charlotte Street; the houses contracted by the few black middle-class families who paid down payments on them run up. Meanwhile, the arzon-fen-country industry continues to devastate whole sections of the city. City council­man Gerona-Valentin had a better idea when he called for Soviet aid for the South Bronx.

The solution lies in the major thorn thatched old order, and ordered cold air pumped through the heating system to drive the institute out! Outside St. Vincent’s Hospital in Greenwich Village, they have out all the oil dripping down over the years. question affecting the fate of the American ruling class wants in, and you won’t find a home to go to now. So here we are in the financial capital of world capitalism, and we find an entire underground city—estimates run from 20,000 to 60,000—of homeless thrown out of mental hospitals and prisons. In the South Bronx, Mayor Koch added his usual grotesque touch by announcing with much fanfare plans to build ranch houses (!) on the site with federally subsidized mortgages. Today there are two (count ’em) model ranch houses on Charlotte Street; the houses contracted by the few black middle-class families who paid down payments on them run up. Meanwhile, the arzon-fen-country industry continues to devastate whole sections of the city. City council­man Gerona-Valentin had a better idea when he called for Soviet aid for the South Bronx.
"New York, New York, it's a belluva town. You can buy yourself a condo for $100,000 down, …” But if you haven’t got it, forget it. You better start thinking about Hoboken… if you can afford that.

For years there’s been a housing crisis in Manhattan, but now with multi­billions being made in real estate conversions and speculation, there’s another kind of squeeze. It’s called strangulation. A recent article in the real estate section of the Sunday New York Times (3 February) on the high cost of housing in New York City puts it all together, and the picture is mind­boggling:

“There are young people who cannot afford to live at home, others who double or triple up in tiny apartments and commute who must travel farther and farther to reach pockets of less expensive housing.

“People have been known to consult architects before they consult obste­tricians, postpone marriage for lack of a Separate bedroom and abandon the city entirely when they lose their Manhattan apartment. Middle-income people are moving into glorified tenements in seedy Manhattan neighborhoods and renovated railroad flats in the outer boroughs.

“The displaced poor, meanwhile, move to worse housing in worse areas—or onto the streets.”

This is the kind of scene that happens when urban existence is shot bloody to hell, like Moscow in the 1930s or in Israel during the waves of massive immigration. Communal kitchens, sharing the toilets, and so forth. It’s a living horror, and it’s a big part of what has put New York on the razor’s edge. Rents are astronomical. You can easily spend $600 a month for a loft bed over somebody’s refrigerator. The Times article calculated the cost of an ordinary 1,400-square-foot apartment, with two bedrooms and one and a half baths. They discovered that on the average it would rent for $2,555 a month in Manhattan (the next closest was $1,005 in San Francisco)! And that’s providing you can find such an apartment—the vacancy rate for rented apartments in all of New York City is only 2 percent, according to the latest statistics. It’s grisly but true: if you want a place in Manhattan, it’s a good idea to study the death notices. The survey concluded that a middle-class family income in the Big Apple is now $80,000 and still you would have to pay 40 percent of your income for housing!

Even doctors and lawyers can’t afford to live in Manhattan anymore—or (area code) “212” as we now call it. A doctor we know who has been in practice for ten years, now the chief of a department, can just barely make it into New York as a result of a prior equity, a gift from his parents and considerable scrimping. Russell Baker burlesqued this outlandish situation in a column last year: after mentioning a whopping price for a condo, he was told, was 400 grand, and for something pleasant to come home to, you’re talking 650. These prices were so ludicrous, wrote our favorite pundit, “I hadn’t realized real money was involved” (New York Times, 4 March 1984).

continued on page 10

10,000 NYC Cops Rally for Racist Murder

In an ominous display of racist “cop power,” 10,000 armed New York City police surrounded the Bronx Supreme Court building on February 7 demanding an unrestricted license to murder blacks. Waving clenched fists and chanting in unison, the uniformed killers were protesting the second­degree manslaughter indictment of Emergency Service Unit cop Stephen Sullivan. On October 29, Sullivan gunned down Eleanor Bumpurs, a black 67-year-old grandmother, with two close-range blasts from a 12-gauge shotgun. The racist police mobilization was the biggest in NYC history. It was an armed, political demonstration against any civilian control over the cops’ guns.

The Bronx rally was the latest provocation in a boiling cop revolt that has brought New York to the brink of a racial explosion. After Sullivan was indicted, all 252 of his buddies on the ESU, a SWAT team masquerading as a rescue unit, put in for transfers. When black police commissioner Benjamin Ward said Mrs. Bumpurs’ slaying was “within departmental guidelines,” Bronx DA Mario Merola snapped back that “Hitler’s people were also following his guidelines.” Merola soon expressed regret about the remark, but the cops proved him right. The courthouse siege resembled nothing so much as a mob of continued on page 8