Cops riot to defend fascists
Build workers defence guards!

The bloody cop riot and batonings to death of Blair Peach outside Southall Town Hall on April 23 have once again posed point blank the question of how to smash the fascist National Front. In the wake of this savage police rampage many anti-fascist militants are asking: where do we go from here? The twin strategies advanced in the past -- on the one hand, calls for state bans and peaceful carnivalling by the Anti Nazi League (ANL); on the other, incohesive street brawls with armed thugs in uniform who are determined to protect the fascists -- have manifestly failed. The current impasse dramatically underlines the necessity of a struggle within the organisations of the working class for disciplined mass mobilisations capable of decisively routing the Front.

The election period saw the reawakening of a militant, albeit directionless, opposition to the National Front -- one which is heartening after months of pacifistic do-nothingism from the ANL, its architects in the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and supporters in the International Marxist Group. Angered at the provocative decision of the NF to field 300 candidates in the election, thousands of demonstrators came onto the streets in an attempt to stop the anti-black, anti-union fascist thugs from drumming up support for their intensely chauvinist programme.

But for most part this anger found outlet in indecisive confrontations with the thousands of riot police called up to defend NF meetings. In Leicester, the police frustrated several disorganised substitutionist attempts to combat the Front, put more than a hundred anti-NF militants behind bars and hospitalised dozens more. In Newcastle, Bristol and Bradford similar scenes were re-enacted on a smaller scale.

In Southall, thousands of local Asian residents shut their shops or walked out of the factories in the early afternoon in response to the fascists' declared intention to hold a meeting in the heart of the area that evening. Five thousand -- mainly Asian workers, joined by ANL supporters and others -- gathered for a protest demonstration, only to be met by an equal number of truncheon-wielding cops who wasted no time setting about their bloody work. Deploying to the full their arsenal of 'crow control' riot gear -- their horses, dogs, helicopters and plastic shields -- these 'guardians of law and order' waded into the milling crowds, arresting and beating indiscriminately. By the time they had finished, more than 300 anti-fascists were in jail, countless more in hospital and one, Blair Peach, lay dying on the pavement. During the riot, a few dozen fascists sneaked into their Town Hall meeting place and held their race-hate rally.

Only in Plymouth, where leftists managed to force the fascists to cancel their meeting by occupying the hall beforehand, and in West Bromwich, where an ANL deal with the police allowed 150 anti-fascists into the meeting place to disrupt the NF rally, did anti-front militants get any satisfaction. Overall, the anti-NF mobilisations were not able to take on the fascists, but descended instead into disorderly skirmishes with riot-trained policemen who have shown once again that they are quite prepared to kill in order to guarantee the 'free speech' for the Tydalls and the Websters.

The round of pre-election demonstrations has put the ANL and SWP in a rather militant-seeming light in contrast to the peaceful, legalistic image they have so assiduously cultivated in the past. But in fact the new-found 'leftism' is a sham: the ANL/SWP still call for state bans, they continue to trade on patriotic 'anti-Nazi' sentiment, and above all they refuse to fight within the working-class organisations for mass mobilisations to crush the fascists in the streets.

At the start of the election campaign the ANL was proposing to halt the NF by doing out wads of liberal, social-patriotic propaganda on the horrors of the 'new Nazis' and by pleading with the 'responsible' bourgeoisie to oppose 'antisemitism' with 'neutral' goodwill of the bourgeois state. They politically disarm the working class by encouraging reliance on the bosses' courts and cops to safeguard the gains of the workers movement, and they establish dangerous precedents for future state attacks on the bourgeoisie's class enemies -- the left and labour movement -- under the guise of keeping the democratic order. These legalist manoeuvres are the core of the ANL's strategy: at root, it is trying to convince the 'responsible' bourgeoisie to oppose the Front. This is the same ANL which has consistently refused to call for mass mobilisations to confront the NF -- going so far last September as to lead tens of thousands of anti-fascists away from an NF march through the East End of London.

continued on page 5
Labour traitors paves their way

The 'Iron Lady' in power

Five years of Labour betrayal paved the way for Thatcher's victory. Now her Tory government promises to be the most right-wing since the least war II. Thatcher's 'radical' programme includes tightened immigration laws, deep cuts in education and social security expenditure, sharply increased spending on defence and 'law and order', and - most important of all - a violent onslaught against the trade unions. Following hard in Callaghan's footsteps, she wants to revive the sick capitalist economy at the expense of the working class, as part of a drive to restore some of Britain's lost imperial grandeur.

Wilson and Callaghan first tried to keep wages low and push profits up by making deals with the TUC bureaucrats for 'moderation'. Then, with the Conscientious Callaghan started sinking with open attacks on union organisation, stating bluntly two days before the election that a new Labour government would introduce restrictive anti-union legislation if its deals with the TUC ran aground. Now Thatcher threatens to take on the unions through open confrontation.

But can she succeed where Labour failed? Callaghan's right-wing Labour government, with its strike wave which destroyed Phase Four last winter convinced the bourgeoisie that Labour was a threat. Thatcher promises, more than ever to keep the unions in line for its capitalist paymasters. Thus after having supported the government for years, working class trade unionists turned against it. Thus, Thatcher in the months leading up to the election.

However they were still worried. After all, the last Tory attempt to tame the unions was Heath's confrontation with the miners in 1972-74 - the miners stood tall. Moreover the stridently right-wing Thatcher makes the threat of 1972-74 seem a reasonable moderate by comparison.

The TUC bureaucrats came out for a Tory vote, but only after the miners who struck the first blow in the form of middle-class conservatism while this former was too dangerously radical and confrontational. Now she is in power, surrounded by lords and knights from Eton and Oxbridge, and ready to attack.

From Labour to the Tories

Life under the Tories does not promise to be pleasant for the working class. But then neither was life under Labour. Every one of Labour's anti-working class proposals in is but an extension of the policies enacted by the wage-slash, strikebreaking Callaghan government. Labour's entire election campaign was based on the allegation that the unions were responsible for the miners Callaghan government. Labour's entire election campaign was based on the alleged unpopularity of Callaghan's concessions.

The most vehement reaction to Comrade Khalil was the primary task of restoring capitalist profitability. But, equally predictably, it was joined by virtually every pseudo-revolutionary organisation in the country.

The Socialist Workers Party, which had been screaming for years about the betrayals of the Labour government, went one better. In the language of the TUC group of Left Trotskyists group joined in the 'vote Labour' chorus, each with its own pet gimmicks and slogans. In contrast, the Spartacist League emphatically insisted that the workers had no interest in returning the Labour strikebreakers for another five-year period of attacks.

In the 1974 elections, we called for critical support to Labour candidates in order to draw the class line against the open parties of the bourgeoisie and expose the social democrats before the masses by putting them in power. But to call for votes to Labour at a time when it had thoroughly demonstrated its treachery and was running on its openly anti-working class record and programme would have been to junk Labour's function and drive workers away from socialist democracy, in favour of unvarying and de facto unconditional support for the reformist betrayers.

In opposition to the pro-Callaghan electoral machines, both official and pseudo-revolutionary, we said it is necessary to challenge every stance every direction throughout the election campaign: 'No to the Labour candidates, more than ever to the bourgeois parties. When sections of millionaires, like the Dunlop workers at Spode and the mass of white collar workers who are regularly Russia must be smashed. National Union of Public Employees began talking about withdrawing support from Labour because of the government's unmitigated treachery, we said that they were right, and raised the call for trade union candidates to be run against Labour on a full leftist programme.

In addition we warned that regardless of who won the election, the working class had to prepare for the law-and-order attacks which would face it. Thatcher will now buckle down to her primary task of restoring capitalist profitability.

Fatima Khalil tells the truth about Iran

Last autumn and winter all the fake-left opportunists howled with outrage when we warned of the ayatollahs over the blood-drenched shah would not be a victim of the 'revolution'. It seemed everyone from Iranian Muslims fanatics to fake-Trockyists was frothing madly at our 'lack of principle'. Today yet events in Iran are providing an all-too-clear confirmation of our unique position, and many leftist workers and students are asking, 'What went wrong?'

In America the Spartacist League/Spartacus Youth League seized this opportunity to press home our programme and win recruits to authentic Trotskyism, sponsoring a nationalist-wide speaking tour by Near Eastern communist woman militant Fatima Khalil. The tour has been an unqualified success: Khalil spoke from a total of more than 1000 people in 9 cities and was warmly received. She appeared on leading television and was interviewed widely, garnering full-page coverage in San Francisco's major daily newspaper, the Chronicle as well as a number of shorter articles in other papers. Comrade Khalil was also given the opportunity to make a presentation at the International Spartacists and the Socialist Workers Party of New York, in New York, and put forward the proletariat viewpoint on Iran against the helplessness of the pseudo-leftist opportunists.

Fatima Khalil drew on her Muslim upbringing and many leftist workers and students are asking, 'What went wrong?'

And as a communist Khalil was able to put forward the programme for victory, arguing powerfully for the need to smash the 'Islamic Republic' through socialist revolution:

The slogan of the workers and farmers government is the main slogan in Iran. It is necessary to take out the ayatollahs, raising demands which will contradict the 'Islamic Republic' through socialist revolution.

'The slogan of the workers and farmers government is the main slogan in Iran. It is necessary to take out the ayatollahs, raising demands which will contradict the interest of the masses to victory through socialist revolution. Those so-called revolutionary cadres which can are the masses to victory through socialist revolution. Those so-called revolutionary cadres which can strangle any voice which does not conform to their political goal. And I wonder if the so-called Islamic revolutionaries do not allow people to express their opinion in this country, what is the condition in Iran?' And in Chicago a woman remarked during the discussion period: 'As an Iranian woman, I would like to thank the Spartacist League for being the only organisation to see the clase analysis of Iran, saying that Khomeini was never a progressive and that the Islamic state would mean for the workers and women in particular.'

Comrade Khalil's intensive (and exhausting) three-week tour has been an important part of the international Spartacist tendency's campaign to lead the workers and farmers of the bloody Iranian events as we struggle to crystalise a revolutionary cadre which can lead on Iran's masses to socialist revolution. Those so-called revolutionaries who bailed the ayatollahs cannot even attempt to count today. In contrast to their utter political bankruptcy, Fatima Khalil was able to present a hard, sharp analysis of the situation and programme for victory in Iran. No to the veil! For workers revolution to defeat Islamic reaction!
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Subjective intentions -- remain one of pressuring the very government that is organising to be assassinated.

That night the Forghan Fighters struck again, shooting down Ayatollah Nortex Motahari in a Teheran alley. Whereas he had been assassinated in the street by equally shadowy figures for plotting a pro-American coup, the terrorists denounced 'akhoundism' -- rule by the mullahs -- as the way to political revolution. The commander of the national police force, for example, had announced that the police stations, uniforms, and equipment and the men were being readied for a counter-revolutionary offensive against the regime. The massacres of Monash supporters were, in a word, an offensive against the Khomeini regime.

Khomeini's regime is succeeding in whipping up strators supplemented their cries of 'Death to traitors to Islam'. The hundreds of thousands of demonstrators on the streets of Teheran on May Day demonstrated for the arrest of journalists and scholars who had brought to light the secret Revolutionary Council. The regime has granted virtually unrestricted powers to the Muslim paramilitary units taking shape which will spearhead the coming onslaught on the Iranian left and working class.

A major confrontation between the left and Islamic theocracy has been delayed only by the circulation of the Khomeini regime which is worthy of applause. While the imperialists cry bitterly for their good friends who fabricate the firing squads, proletarian revolutionaries are glad to see some of these sadistic torturers go. We know that it is the torture of Islamists who are the worst of the worst and working people that has been made a capital offence. We know well whose hands hold the rifles of the new 'Guardians' of the post-revolutionist sentence, but we know too that nearly all of these butchers deserve to die. We would gladly extra­ vate them. We would gladly extricate the shah himself to Teheran to face his victims -- and the 'vacation' of this mass murder.

The creation of Khomeini's Islamic state requires this deep-going blood purge. For every general who has fallen on an ex-imperial colonel takes his place. But it has taken time to discipline the irregular Muslim militia:

cadres from the wreckage of the shah's army and police.

It is not simply brutal military suppression which puts the Iranian left in peril but, as in Indonesia in 1965, the palpable ability of a combined assault by the regular army and a viciously anti-communist Muslim mass movement. Using the apocalyptic role it has also meant the execution of some of the most hated butchers of the shah's Savak butchers deserve to die. We would gladly extra­ vate them.

The common denominator of this march was a series of radical demands which would be raised by every group: the women's demand to see the veil; the workers suffering from massive unemployment; the students demanding the right to strike, nationalisation of the banks and the national minorities, who have already been attacked with tanks and helicopter gunships as square. There Ayatollah Shariatmadari's Islamic Republic Party drew a crowd of 100,000 comprised of activists and supporters -- the mullahs' traditional plebeian base. Once again the theme of the rally was 'get the left'. But this time the banners added the incredible slander that 'Marrists are the agents of the shah'!

According to Le Monde the two separate leftist gatherings held elsewhere in the city were roughly the same size as the mullah-run anti-May Day. The Tudeh party's march demonstrated its continuing strength among the industrial working class and the trade unions, but at the same time reaffirmed its complete capitulation to Khomeini, repeatedly empha­ sizing its support to the 'Islamic Republic'. The other leftist demonstration was a noisy combination of workers, students, the unemployed, the bourgeois nationalist National Democratic Front, various Maoist sects, the fake-Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (RBS) and the Fedayeen. The common denominator of this march was a series of radical demands which would be raised by revolutionary Marrists as well: recognition of the right to strike, nationalisation of foreign-controlled firms, the end of censorship in the mass media. But other demands raised at the May Day gathering, for example, that workers should have a say in the editing of the constit­ uent, demonstrate that the perspective of these Stalinists, social democrats, guer­ rillists and liberals -- whatever their
The fight against fascism in the 1930s

The victory at Cable Street

On 4 October 1936, upwards of 250,000 working-class demonstrators -- including the East End of London, wave after wave of charging cops failed to break through the workers' barricades. In particular Jewish East End of London, the Spanish workers' organisations to smash the fascists, show that they had learned some of the lessons of these struggles.

Fighting the Blackshirts

In addition to Cable Street, there were several other mass working-class demonstrations which stopped the Mosleyites during the 1930s. For example, on 8 September 1936 in Hyde Park, a rally of about 150,000 counterdemonstrators was held in Hyde Park against the BUF. At the same time, a similar demonstration was held in the East End of London, which was effectively blocked by a turnout of about 5,000 Blackshirt counterdemonstrators. Victory in these battles was not achieved without the support of significant capitalist interests (particularly those who favoured an alliance with Hitler's Germany) including the open endorsement of the Daily Mail.

Two booklets in particular provide a vivid picture of the fight against fascism during this period -- and especially of the treacherous role of the leadership of the Communist Party (CP), whose working-class supporters were often ready and anxious to stop the fascists in the streets. The Pogrom in Ed -- an official Stalinist chronicle by Phil Piratin, CP Member of Parliament for Stepney (Mile End) from 1945-50 -- has recently been reissued by Lawrence and Wishart off the streets of East London.

The CP leadership had spent the previous months appealing to the Tory-dominated powers to outlaw labour movements, such as the ILP and the BUF. Instead of joining the struggle for democratic freedoms, the CP leadership was ready and willing to use the struggle against fascism as an opportunity to further its alliance with Labour and anti-fascist activities. Such was the fruit of the 'new road' of state bans against the fascists.

The CP decided to march let him go. The most graphic example of this was the CP's original reaction to the scheduled fascist march of October 1936. Jacobs reproduces in his book the instructions left for him by the East London CP organizer five days before the march, which included the instructions:

"Keep order; no excuse for provocation; try to say, 'Keep the peace.' If Mosley decides to march, he can't march let him go. Don't attempt disorder. (Time too short to get a 'They shall not pass' policy across. It would only be a harmful stunt.)"

The CP leadership was ready and willing to desert its own members in the East End, most of whom wanted to build a massive demonstration to stop the BUF. Along with the centrist Independent Labour Party (ILP), the CP had spent the previous months appealing to the Tory-dominated National Government to ban the planned fascist march.

Both were pushing a 150,000-signature petition for the arrest of the leaders, as were numerous rightist Jewish leaders and Labour Party hacks. Meanwhile, the ILP had called for an anti-Mosley counterdemonstration to rally at Aldgate, hoping to use this as a part of a last-ditch effort to pressure the government into stopping the Blackshirt march.

The CP was however determined until almost the last minute to press ahead with a planned demonstration on the other side of London -- a rally in Trafalgar Square to raise funds for the Popular Front in Spain, which was then frantically disregarding and crushing the independent workers militias. Three days before the Blackshirt march, the party finally bowed to pressure from its own ranks and from the working class in the East End, and cancelled its rally for Spain in order to call on its supporters to help stop Mosley.

Thanks to the hundreds of thousands of determined workers who turned out, the Blackshirts were stopped -- despite the politically bankrupt strategy of the CP and ILP leadership.

The CP periodically throw its weight behind the Spanish workers' organisations to smash the fascists etc. In the midst of the battle for control of the streets, ILP MP Fenner Brockway provided the crowning spectacle of opportunism subservience to the capitalist state. The phone box to call the Home Office and ask them, one last time, to ban the fascist march.

The massive turnout at Cable Street brought a horrified reaction from the bourgeoisie. Fearful lest there be any repetition of the events of that day, Parliament passed the Public Order Act a few months later, giving the police wide-spread power to ban marches. This particularly reactionary piece of legislation was by no means mainly directed against Mosley's Blackshirt parades. The bourgeoisie had been troubled since the early 1930s by the CP and its Bolshevik-Leninist (Militant) Group, issued a leaflet on the Cable Street demonstration calling for: 'workers defend fascists.' For this they had been ridiculed by the press as 'the CP's official organ'.

Bohlekh-Leninists: 'For workers defence corps'

In sharp contrast to the opportunism of the Stalinists and 'New Left' to the right, the Bolshevik-Leninist (Militant) Group issued a call to the public to form 'defence corps'. Bohlekh-Leninists: 'For workers defence corps!' They issued a call to the public to form 'defence corps'. In sharp contrast to the opportunism of the Stalinists and 'New Left' to the right, the Bolshevik-Leninist (Militant) Group issued a call to the public to form 'defence corps'. In sharp contrast to the opportunism of the Stalinists and 'New Left' to the right, the Bolshevik-Leninist (Militant) Group issued a call to the public to form 'defence corps'. In sharp contrast to the opportunism of the Stalinists and 'New Left' to the right, the Bolshevik-Leninist (Militant) Group issued a call to the public to form 'defence corps'. In sharp contrast to the opportunism of the Stalinists and 'New Left' to the right, the Bolshevik-Leninist (Militant) Group issued a call to the public to form 'defence corps'. In sharp contrast to the opportunism of the Stalinists and 'New Left' to the right, the Bolshevik-Leninist (Militant) Group issued a call to the public to form 'defence corps'.
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Workers defence... (Continued from page 1)

By its very nature as a popular-frontist alliance with bourgeois 'personalities' and labour bureaucrats, the ANL cannot be a long-term organisation capable of launching an organisation which can actually turn out tens of thousands of disciplined workers to crush the fascists and bolster its anti-fascist reputation.

While it is capable of being a short-term stopgap in a mass anti-fascist movement, the fascists have already made it clear that they will 'crush' anti-fascist groups bit by bit if it is not 'neutralised'. The fascist squads working under armed police within the trade unions for mass anti-fascist action, and that action did occur was diverted as much as possible into safe class-collaborationist channels.

However the CP cadres' years of working together meant that they were able to bring a certain level of order to the politico-military organisation to the crowds that turned out that day. This gave them a rudimentary military competence sufficient to thwart police efforts to open up a rudimentary military competence sufficient to thwart police efforts to open up a rearguard action, and to prevent widening the area towards which the fascist squads were moving. The CP(C) leadership was able to ensure a certain discipline in its ranks, and to prevent widening the area towards which the fascist squads were moving.

End of the Blackshirts

As late as August 1973, the National Front had been able to gain a foothold on the streets of London. What has this to do with the IMG student with his 'race-hatred' -- are they the currency of anti-fascist demonstrations any more? Should we demand a platform for the National Front whenever it has a rally on the streets? Should we demand a platform for the National Front whenever it has a rally on the streets?

The economic rot of British capitalism in decline has created the conditions for the emergence of fascism as a serious, although still marginal, force in British politics. The growing feeling that the traditional recipes of both Labour and the TUC are unable to guarantee social stability and progress has produced a certain sense of despair which the NF, with its 'solutions' of deporting West Indians and assimilating immigrants in order to 'create jobs' for native-born white Englishmen, has been able to exploit.

The National Front are clearly not going to disappear because they suffered at the polls. But the NF leaders for Hitlerite German fascism is an impediment to their aspirations to lead a mass fascist movement in Britain. As late as August 1973, the National Front had been able to gain a foothold on the streets of London. What has this to do with the IMG student with his 'race-hatred' -- are they the currency of anti-fascist demonstrations any more? Should we demand a platform for the National Front whenever it has a rally on the streets?

It has been argued that the IMG student with his 'race-hatred' are the currency of anti-fascist demonstrations any more? Should we demand a platform for the National Front whenever it has a rally on the streets?
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Healyites: Kill a commie for Qaddafi

In May of last year, 21 members of the Iraqi Communist Party (CP) were executed on charges of forming cells within the army. This judicial murder was part of a major crackdown on the mass party of the Iraqi Ba'athist regime, led by the bourgeois-nationalist Ba'athist Party. According to Iraqi CP leaders, some 18,000 party members are now sitting in jail. Though the pre-Wovan-Stalinist leaders still seek friendly relations with the Baghdad butchers, they are obliged to go through the motions of protesting the persecution of their Iraqi comrades. So the British CP press, the Morning Star, has run a few articles exposing anti-communist terror in Iraq.

In response the following recently appeared in a certain British paper:

"At the obvious instigation of the Kremlin, the Communist Party of Iraq (the CPoI) of Iraq has become the centre of an immense slander offensive against the basis of the Arab Revolution -- the masses and their revolutionary vanguard, the Arab Ba'athist Socialist Party. It is true that CPoI measures were executed last year for illegally forming cells in the army. The purpose of these cells was to fight against the government. There are no priors for the answer to what would happen to Ba'athists who set up cells in the Soviet army. They would be ruthlessly purged!

Is this perhaps a letter from the CP press at the time? No, it is a letter from a certain British paper entitled 'A Conspiration Exposed.' The February issue of the fake-Trotskyist Workers Revolutionary Party (WRP) of Gerry Healy and Michael Banda. The editors of the WRP have now become so preoccupied that they can openly support the murder of workers in Iraq! Is this the party that at one time gave refuge to the Healy/Banda tendency? The Healy/Banda tendency has long had an extremely unsavoury flavour. It combines idiot organisation sectarianism with the wildest paranoia. But in the past few years its more than a trace of paranoia. So now it must be shameless apologists for Qaddafi's yellow journalists in Clapham High Street.

From an historical point of view, the Arab Ba'ath Socialist Party of Iraq has played a bourgeois-nationalist role in its struggle against the Soviet bureaucracy. I recall seeing in a certain British paper: 'At the obvious instigation of the Kremlin, the Communist Party of Iraq?'

'At the obvious instigation of the Kremlin, the Communist Party of Iraq? How is that possible? how is it conceivable? But in the past few years their newspaper is reprinted in a certain British paper: "At the obvious instigation of the Kremlin, the Communist Party of Iraq?"

'At the obvious instigation of the Kremlin, the Communist Party of Iraq?' How is that possible? how is it conceivable? But in the past few years their newspaper is reprinted in a certain British paper: "At the obvious instigation of the Kremlin, the Communist Party of Iraq?"

'We have long maintained that beneath the bull: a blow by bluster of Healy, Banda & Co is the coward legalistic endemica to the British Labour movement. The Stalinists cadres in the Iraq army, despite their class-colleaborationist policy, remain, along with Qaddafi's yellow journalist in Clapham High Street, the most unrepentant and unrepentant for the murder of workers in Iraq! Is this the party that at one time gave refuge to the Healy/Banda tendency? The Healy/Banda tendency has long had an extremely unsavoury flavour. It combines idiot organisation sectarianism with the wildest paranoia. But now it must be shameless apologists for Qaddafi's yellow journalists in Clapham High Street.
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Do the Healyites then maintain that Ba'athism is not a capitalist state? Or perhaps the answer must be that they defend the murder of workers as against capitalist state repression only for w groups which don't do anything illegal, like classes within the party, with the exception of their own organisations. For the attacks of the capitalist state.

But, as the facts show, that has nothing to do with the incidents in Iraq.

We have long maintained that beneath the bull: boy bluster of Healy, Banda & Co is the coward legalistic endemica to the British Labour movement.
Cable Street...

(Continued from page 5)

hold a ‘peace’ rally of 20,000 at Earl’s Court. The fascist movement was only broken up during World War II, when its leaders, tainted by their association with the war criminals, were thrown in jail and the organisation suspended. According to bourgeois academic Robert Benewick, in July 1938, the Fascists, ‘faced with a final circular telling their members that Britain was now threatened by invasion and that they should do everything to support the war effort of the nation’ (The Fascist Movement in Britain). Having united the nation behind the patriotic war effort, the fascists no longer required the services of the fascist gangs.

Many bourgeois historians and social democrats claim that the British fascist movement, unlike its continental counterpart, was killed off by the outbreak of war. This is nonsense. The fascists were able to continue their illegal activities during the war, even though their leaders were not actually at war with their own organisation. Meanwhile, the fascist gangs were able to carry on their illegal activities during the war, even though their leaders were not actually at war with their own organisation.

Moeley’s Blackshirts did not get very far in part because the British bourgeoisie did not have the same compelling need to support the fascist solution as did the German capitalist class. Having inflicted a major defeat on the working class in the mid-1930s, they claim that fascists in Britain would have died of natural causes.

None of the sauces you have been served by the fascist leaders have stood up to the test of time. The movement was never as decisively tested as the German workers movement was, it is nonetheless true that the most anti-HIP mobilisations were the key to depriving Moeley of his potential base of support.

From Cable Street to Brick Lane

The struggles of the 1930s are rich in lessons, of which we have drawn but a few here. Unfortunately, the most direct and clearcut conclusions can only be utilised by those who are willing to carry forward the Trotskyist programme. Cyntica like the SWP can commemorate Cable Street by using it as a weapon against the imperialists. Already, the rightist bureaucrats are becoming more desperate. The STP have rediscovered their watchword of ‘Unity against the Tories’ -- ie unity behind the Labour Party. The STP have even been known to use the fascist slogan ‘We will take back Cable Street’ -- except that the Stalins eventually changed their position while the SWP couldn’t change its watchword.

Colin Sparks actually writes in a review of the Piratin and Jacobs books in Socialist Review:

In my opinion, the reason why the leadership of the SWP was determined to press on with a jobsworth Cable Street lobby is that from the beginning they had backed an immigrant as an enemy of the European lobby. They had always had to do with their claim that it was impossible to organise an opposition.

January 1979

But for Trotskyists it is both an inspiration and a guide to revolutionary action.

‘Iron Lady’...
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ability on the backs of the working class, whilst pursuing an aggressively reactionary foreign policy chiefly characterised by fervent anti-Sovietism.

The Queen’s speech, which opened Parliament on May 15 was only a slightly toned-down re-write of the Tory election manifesto, with its manifold anti-working class proposals. Already the Tories had shown that the old anti-Sovietism in the police and army have been given a hefty pay rise, blood-money for the strikes of the future. The British capitalists may well be those public sector workers -- teachers, postmen and the strategically crucial power station workers with their threats pending. Both the postmen and power workers gave the new government warning by overwhelmingly rejecting the government’s offers. This is a warning that the new Conservative government is not able on the backs of the working class, whilst pursuing an aggressively reactionary foreign policy chiefly characterised by fervent anti-Sovietism.
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Since its creation more than 20 years ago, the European Economic Community (EEC) or Common Market has been an imperialist alliance ultimately aimed at the bureaucratic degenerated Soviet workers state, the industrial and military powerhouse of the one-third of the world where capitalist rule has been overthrown. The first direct elections to the European 'parliament' at Strasbourg this June pose the question of the EEC before the working classes of capitalist Europe.

So one is surprised that the parliamentary creations of the British Labour and French Communist parties are running in the elections even though they are formally opposed to the institutionalist capitalist Common Market. But one might think that a self-styled 'revolutionary Marxist' international tendency which states that 'working people have nothing to hope for and nothing to defend in this capitalist Common Market or its parliament', would not participate in this Euro-imperialist charade. Yet the fake-Trotskyist United Secretariat (USec) of Ernest Mandel is not participating in the elections for the economic adjunct of NATO, but is making this its big campaign of the season.

The EEC was originally set up in the mid-1950s as part of the American-directed reorganisation of West Europe against the Soviet bloc. Washington policymakers were concerned that French opposition to German dominance of Europe could lead to a revival of Paris' traditional alliance with Moscow, as in the 1935 Stalins-Laval pact. The Common Market was and remains an economic compromise essentially between the French and German ruling classes in the context of their political/military alliance against the USSR.

Ernest Mandel's claim that the Common Market is the embryo of a capitalist United States of Europe, 'an intermediate stage between a simple loose confederation of states and a supra-national state' (Bouge, 27 April 1979) is in line with the general trend of the EEC in the sense whereby West German imperialism helps finance the entity of the 'free world'. Direct elections to this utterly inapt body attempt to give a pseudo-democratic facade to an alliance of imperialist nation-states.

Reformist objections to the Common Market

The West German-imposed free market regime in the EEC requires certain favoured reformist policies, such as subsidising nationalised industries. Therefore, there has been national-reformist opposition to the Common Market, especially strong in Britain which is also hard hit by its agricultural protectionism. Our principled opposition to the EEC and to its expansion has nothing in common with the social-chauvinism of the British left Labourites or French Stalinists. We do not oppose the EEC primarily because the Brussels bureaucracy can on paper override the decisions of the national parliaments. Nor are we overly concerned that Common Market regulations restrict this or that form of state intervention in the economy. We are implacably opposed to the EEC above all, because it provides economic glue for holding together the Western imperialist alliance against the Soviet Union.

Recognising that the arrogantly capitalist Common Market is unpopular among class-conscious workers in France and Britain, the German Social Democrats (SPD) are presenting a left face in these elections. With Willy Brandt heading the SPD list they are running their trade-union/officials and a couple of ex-New Leftists, types they would never think of standing for the Bundestag. Furthermore, the SPD is campaigning for a European-wide 35 hour working week, seeking to present the EEC as a potential agency for labour reform. The German Social Democrats do not raise the shorter working week in the Bundestag, much less fight for it on the picket line, but talk about it only in the Strasbourg parliament which has absolutely no power to do anything. By some odd coincidence, the USec is also making the 35 hour working week one of their main demands in the EEC elections. Perhaps the Mandelites will claim that Helmut Schmidt's party is tailing them!

Against Stalinist nationalism and anti-German chauvinism

The EEC elections have found the Eurocommunists at each other's throats. The French CP, for example, is opposing Spain's entry into the EEC because it will increase competition for France's farmers. Carillo's Spanish CP, which out of sympathy to its own bourgeois national-chauvinism favours entry, in turn denounces Marchais' party for 'parish-pump patriotism' and 'cheap electioneering'.

More ominously, the French Stalinists along with the Gaullists are turning the EEC elections into a focus for anti-German chauvinism. The Stalinists and Gaullists have sought to channel popular hostility to Giscard's 'free market' remedy of unemployment by whipping up hysteria against a 'boche' (krank) menace. The French CP's vile slogans feature 'No to a German Europe' and 'Paris Will Not Become a Suburb of Bonn'.

The old German social democrat August Bebel called anti-semitism 'the socialism of fools'. In France today anti-bocheism has become the socialism of fools and opportunists. In reality, German industrial strength is one of the main objective bases for a Socialist United States of Europe. A reunified German workers state will be a most powerful force for the reconstruction of Europe, for overcoming poverty and backwardness in Britain, the Mezzogiorno, Ireland, Greece etc.

How USec legitimises an imperialist alliance

National parliaments represent an historic gain of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions and remain more progressive than alternative forms of bourgeois rule -- fascist or military bureaucracies. But the European parliament has no progressive content at all; it merely serves to mask the real nature of the EEC as an imperialist alliance. The USec's campaign around the EEC elections is a parliamentary cretinism in the service of a public relations gimmick. What if NATO's North Atlantic Council were constituted by direct elections, or the colonialist British Commonwealth set up a pseudo-parliamentary body: would the USec seek representation in these imperialist alliances? We can only assume that they would?

The USec's main slogan in the elections is continued on page 7