Smash Taft-Hartley!

BURN CARTER'S CONTRACT!

FEBRUARY 28—Nearly 160,000 coal miners have waged the most explosive and militant strike struggle in the last 30 years. With courage and determination, the ranks of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) have shut down not only their own mines but the scab mines which threatened their strike and the very existence of their union. Already two miners have been killed defending their picket lines and hundreds arrested, but still the strike has remained 100 percent solid.

After already throwing back one abominable sellout agreement worked out by UMWA president Arnold Miller and the Bituminous Coal Operators Association (BCOA), the crucial showdown in the strike is fast approaching. If the current giveaway contract proposal is turned down by the membership—and there are plenty of indications that they may do just that—the stage is set for a mammoth confrontation between the miners and the bosses' government. The entire labor movement must prepare now to take action in defense of the UMWA strike!

The success of the miners strike has surpassed the worst fears of the federal and state governments, the coal operators, the steel and energy barons and the rest of big business. Corporate executives who three months ago sat smugly atop mountains of stockpiled coal and sneered at the miners are now squealing with fright. With utility and industrial stocks rapidly dwindling to crisis levels requiring widespread power cutbacks, the miners have seized a position of strength that has thrown their enemies into a cold sweat. It is vital that the miners hold fast and fight for victory.

With the bosses' backs to the wall, Jimmy Carter has been stepping up the pressure, announcing an eleventh-hour "settlement" on nationwide television Friday night. Carter backed up his appeal for ratification with a pistol pointed at the miners' heads: if they didn't agree to the contract proposal, continued on page 4.
On February 15 Rhodesian prime minister Ian Smith beamed to reporters in Salisbury as he announced an agreement with black leaders Abel Muzorewa and James Chirau. Termed an "internal settlement" by Smith, he hopes it will prevent Rhodesia from "basically being reduced to a minority privilege by adding some black faces to the government and conceding a black majority in a powerless parliament."

The "moderate" blacks who have added their authority to the agreement with the brutal white supremacists, were quick to proclaim the Salisbury pact as the realization of their goals of "majority rule." And Sithole was dispatched to London to sell the accord to British imperialism as the answer to its Rhodesian quandary. The Tory Sunday Times (19 February) was easily convinced: "a dazzling coup," it said.

But Imperialist spokesmen were less impressed. David Owen, foreign secretary of Britain's Labour government, initially hedged, then under pressure from Tory MP's in the House of Commons called it a "significant step toward majority rule." Jimmy Carter's front man for Africa, UN ambassador Andrew Young, however, criticized the settlement as not addressing "the issues that have 20,000 people fighting." The agreement, Owen and Britain's dilemma, however, requires an end to the drawn-out guerrilla fighting which continually threatens to disrupt the fragile stability of southern Africa. Smith fears for the future of white domination in Rhodesia while the Western imperialists are worried by the spectre of Soviet influence through arms aid and guerrilla training. Any illusions which may have existed as to the ability of Smith's accord to undermine the guerrilla efforts were quickly dispelled. A spokesman for the Patriotic Front, the uneasy and often bloody alliance of Joshua Nkomo's Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and Robert Mugabe's Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), denounced the agreement as "meaningless and worthless as the paper on which it is written." Nkomo himself said, "We intend to finish him [Smith]." Perhaps most significantly, the Zambian government, upon whose support and territory ZAPU depends, declared that "the internal settlement will never end the war in Zimbabwe."

The guerrilla leaders' intramurals does not represent militancy so much as simple recognition of the reality of the Salisbury agreement is an ill-fated attempt to perpetuate the extreme political isolation of a tiny white minority which is outnumbered by blacks 19-to-1. Although the racist regime in Salisbury has survived for 13 years since the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, faced with such overwhelming odds its ultimate fate is sealed.

Even the modest level of guerrilla activity in recent years—Nkomo's forces—compared to the intensity of FREELMO's independence struggle in Mozambique, for instance, reflects the poorly equipped Rhodesian army and caused severe economic dislocations. The military drain on the economy has made guerrilla forays into the cities have given rise to a stampede from the country. Estimates are that the white population declined by 12,000 (or 4 percent) in 1977 and these numbers probably do not include those whites who have gone "on vacation."

Smith's strategy is twofold. On the one hand he is attempting to give the appearance of making concessions to black leaders in order to enhance both his and their authority. For example, he ostentatiously abandoned his long-held support for a "qualified franchise" in favor of "universal suffrage." At the same time, he is attempting to assure the white population that their position as a "victor" will remain unchanged.

Thus most of the negotiated agreement consists of a series of guarantees to whites. The key feature of the accord grants them 28 seats in a 100-seat parliament. Twenty of these seats are to be elected by black "voters" and the remaining eight seats, while elected by common ballot, will be nominated exclusively by whites. These 28 seats will give the tiny privileged minority an effective veto over legislation. Thus the Smith/Zuzeora agreement, touted as "majority rule," in fact amounts to "one white, seven votes."

In addition there are guarantees against nationalizations. While the guerrillas are offered "amnesty" and the option of retraining and integration into the new army, there is little doubt that the core of that new army will be the current security forces. For those whites who remain edgy, the agreement guarantees that they may retain dual citizenship (one-third of white Rhodesians hold South African passports, one-third hold South African passports, and one-third British passports) and receive pensions outside the country.

The black leaders have been quick to allay white fears. Thus Sithole (who was once sentenced for conspiracy to assassinate Smith) and Muzorewa have apparently conceded that the obdurate Rhodesian Front leader and long-time premier will play a key role in the transitional administration, possibly as its leader.

The ability of Smith to sell an agreement preserving the racist status quo as a significant compromise certainly depends on his ability to portray his "moderate" black cohorts as legitimate representatives of the black masses. Muzorewa and Sithole have accordingly been none too modest in their claims of popularity. According to Muzorewa, 80 percent of the electorate will back his United African National Council in the elections. Sithole, who has been more less isolated since his ouster from ZANU, claims to have the support of 4,500 blacks in the guerrilla forces. Their contribution to the establishment of a black-ruled Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) will be to lay down their arms when he receives his portfolio!

But the legitimacy of all three of the "moderate" blacks is more than suspect. Chairu, a government-paw tribal chief that Chairu's resignation from that post never opposed Smith and, in fact, served in his cabinet at a salary of $35,000 per year. There were widespread suspicions that Chairu's resignation from that post was engineered in order to give Smith a black "leader" to negotiate with. Sithole owes his return to Rhodesia to South Africa's patronage.

Muzorewa, in many respects the key to the settlement, has in fact been greeted by tens of thousands of whites and blacks throughout the country. But "Muz" owes much of his prestige simply to his position as bishop of the American Methodist Episcopal Church in Rhodesia and his membership in a Shona-speaking tribe. While ZAPU/ZANU militants were being driven into exile or murdered, Muzorewa was attending bible colleges in the U.S. His appointment as ANC head in 1971 was a reflection of his non-affiliation with any faction.

In order to shore up his credentials as a militant, Muzorewa engaged in a little transparent bravado during the negotiations. When Smith established the opening of negotiations by ordering a "murderous foray into Mozambique, Muzorewa announced a boycott of the talks—for a few weeks. A similar boycott, prompted by insults from the Rhodesian negotiators, resulted in the "victory" of the eight commonly elected fully white parliament seats.

The short-term viability of the Smith/Muzorewa agreement depends in large measure on support from the principal imperialist powers involved, the U.S. and Britain. The British bourgeoisie and even sections of the petty bourgeoisie retain considerable ties with and sympathy for their Rhodesian kith-and-kin. The Tories will make it a major election issue if the Labour government pressures Smith to deal with the black "extremists" like Mugabe.

American imperialism is free to subordinate racist solidarity to longer-term strategic interests. However, both imperialist powers want, above all, to avoid a war to the finish, which might allow the Soviet bloc to provide decisive military support to the Zimbabwe nationalists. Thus the U.S./British policy is to induce all the African nationalist groups to accept the kind of "majority rule" that is acceptable to the 4 percent white population.

The current Smith maneuver raises a number of problems for Washington. 

---
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Nixon's reactionary omnibus criminal code, the infamous S-1 bill, died in Congress in 1975. But today it has been born again in Senate Bill No. 1437. The "reformed" bill, co-sponsored by liberal Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts and arch-conservative Representative John McClellan, breezed through the Senate and with the House of Representatives, where it has a good chance to become law.

The new bill, killed by liberal opposition which included the New York Times, Washington Post and Wall Street Journal, is a dramatic example of the spirit of S-1 is alive and kicking. One can only remember the present criminal statutes to give the new bill a chance to become law.

S-1437 Threatens Labor

Our political mobilization. The extent of liberal concern for "depression," the many contradictory and inconsistent statements about how their "friend" Jimmy Carter and his allies on Capitol Hill will help the unions. But labor is not simply a matter of the class struggle, as the heroic example of the coal miners' militancy proves. After all, the only reason Carter has thus far hesitated to employ the Taft-Hartley Act is that he did not want to risk an upsurge of liberal opposition to S-1437. The results of the unions' strategy proves that the unions could be accused of "legitimate" actions which were aimed against strikers. This section is aimed at bringing the bill into the courts. Even "legitimate" labor actions, if they get 99 percent of what they want, they can only remember the liberal crime code.

S-1437 is a dramatic example of the danger the liberal criticism of the Right. It is not likely to get much support from the New York Times, Washington Post and Wall Street Journal.

The new bill, killed by liberals is S-1437's dramatic example of the spirit of S-1 is alive and kicking. One can only remember the present criminal statutes to give the new bill a chance to become law.

S-1437 is now awaiting action in the Senate. The liberal Senators, where it has a good chance to become law.

S-1437 is a dramatic example of the danger the liberal criticism of the Right. It is not likely to get much support from the New York Times, Washington Post and Wall Street Journal.

The future of such legislation will be decided in the course of the class struggle, as the heroic example of the coal miners' militancy proves. After all, the only reason Carter has thus far hesitated to employ the Taft-Hartley Act is that he did not want to risk an upsurge of liberal opposition to S-1437. The results of the unions' strategy proves that the unions could be accused of "legitimate" actions which were aimed against strikers. This section is aimed at bringing the bill into the courts. Even "legitimate" labor actions, if they get 99 percent of what they want, they can only remember the liberal crime code.
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immediately, a Taft-Hartley injunction and government seizure of the mines was next on the agenda. But slicker politicians than Carter—namely Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman—have tried these threats and the miners outlasted them every time. The Democratic administration has refrained from these strikebreaking measures so far only because it is afraid they wouldn't work.

At the height of the historic 1937 sitdown strike which led to the formation of the United Auto Workers through a fierce struggle against General Motors, the embattled strikers faced with political attacks, public vilification and corporate intransigence. At that moment one strike leader expressed the miners' determination in a message to CIO leader John L. Lewis: "We got 'em by the balls and a little more," That is our advice to the miners now.

Carter's contract should be voted down, torn up, burned in bonfires and its ashes flung back at the government and the mine bosses' faces! With the coal once gone, inedible and carcinogenic, many politicians on the run, now is no time to give in. If the miners reject the government-engineered sellout, they will certainly be attacked for greed, causing flu and pneumonia and damaging the "national interest." Their attackers will be the oil, steel and coal magnates who regularly gouge the American people with their monopoly control; and the government which spends billions on weapons and sends hundreds of thousands of its sons off to die in imperialist wars.

If Carter invokes Taft-Hartley, seizes the mines and/or sends in troops it will split the country on sharp lines: for or against the miners. The union movement must throw its tremendous power behind the strikers. Of course, backstabbing labor traitors like AFL-CIO head George Meany or UAW president Doug Fraser have already lined up behind Carter and the bourgeoisie. But for hundreds of thousands of steel workers slaving under a no-strike agreement, auto workers slaving under the speed-up of the assembly line and millions of unionists throughout the country, the miners' strike which they support is the only hope. If the government moves against the coal strikers to attempt to force them back to work, general protest strikes should be called to repulse the strikebreaking offensive.

Prayers and Sweet Talk

It was no accident that the announcement of the "tentative agreement" on February 24 came neither from officials of the UMWA nor from the BCOA but from the mouth of the "chief executive" of the capitalist class. Despite Carter's transparently diabolical maneuver to "accelerate the free process of collective bargaining," everybody knew this contract was written, promoted and forced on the miners by the heavy hand of the federal government.

Carter coupled his announcement with a condescending "man-to-man" personal appeal for ratification so filled with false flattery that it drew hoots and guffaws in coal field bars where miners gathered to watch the news. But the president ended up with a threat: "If it is not approved without delay... I will have to take the drastic and unsatisfactory legal action which I would have announced tonight."

Two days later Carter sought additional help and was in a Washington, D.C. church praying for a yes vote. Though personally afraid to venture out into the coal towns, UMWA president Arnold Miller predicted a ratification, launched a $40,000 media blitz and threatened district officials and International representatives with disciplinary action if they didn’t "use their best effort to secure approval by the members."

But despite all the threats, appeals and cajoling, there was a growing indication that the miners were not impressed by the government-imposed contract. While Carter was praying, 2,000 angry miners rallied in West Franklin, Ohio and denounced the sellout. The next day over 200 district leaders called to Washington for a briefing on the terms left the Capitol Hilton meeting with the bosses attempting to qualitatively weaken the union and demoralize the miners. What the coal operators are mainly interested in is cracking the tremendous solidarity that has always been the great strength of the UMWA. By their massive wildcat strikes the coal miners have shown that they will not allow the operators to pick this union apart a mine at a time.

Rip It Up! Burn It!

The big business press is playing up wailing complaints of BCOA executives over the "concessions" they have made since their initial February 6 deal with Miller, thrown back in disgust by an outraged membership. By their intransigence and solidarity, the miners have beaten back a number of the BCOA's take-away demands. The current contract proposal does not contain the earlier clauses allowing incentive speed-up schemes, probation periods for new employees, Sunday work, the unlimited wearing effects of the long strike must be taken off the list on the strikes' morale, for the miners to settle now for the government/BCOA/Miller terms would be a disaster. Nearly three months ago the miners walked off their jobs for the right to strike, restoration of their health cards, guaranteed and equalized pensions and safety in what is the U.S.’ most dangerous industry. The proposed contract answers none of these demands and, in fact, is far worse than the sellout only narrowly ratified in 1974.

Both the miners and the operators know this strike was not a run-of-the-mill strike over wages and fringe benefits. It is a fundamental conflict...
Behind the seeming practical or particular productivity problem may be solved.

...of their state troopers they could "low cap" and hence gain new strike arsenals. MINERS who refuse to cross a picket line are no longer subject to fines or penalties under the original BCOA/Miller contract. Nevertheless, simply being on a picket line, at any mine of any BCOA company is sufficient cause for dismissal. This would effectively

Miners picketing has cut off production of scab coal, stockpiles to near depletion.

Carter Strongarms the Miners

Miller agreement! In the earlier propos

...a state of open rebellion against their own disgraced leadership and were clearly not going to accept the more obviously ominous of the terms Miller had agreed to.

...the bosses' greedy desire to rush through a new contract which allows the mining industry to escape its share of the public debt. Indeed, the union lost its last year, two years a maximum of 30 cents is provided annually for cost-of-living adjustments. Thus, the maximum that the miners can get is $2.40, only a nickel more than they were offered earlier. But if the consumer price index should not rise enough to hit the 30 cent annual "cap" they could actually receive less than the $2.35 promised earlier!

...in the original BCOA/Miller pact, the training period, when new miners must work together with an experienced senior miner, is cut in half, from 90 to 45 days. In the mines, where an accident-and-death rate is seven times that of any other industry, more maimings and murder will result from the bosses' greed to rush ill-trained miners to the coal face. The coal operators would undoubtedly like to have obtained even more take-away provisions and instituted more strict controls on the combative miners. But particularly after the February 6 "tentative agreement" debacle, the miners were in a state of open rebellion against their own disgraced leadership and were clearly not going to accept the more obviously ominous of the terms Miller had agreed to.

...the mine bosses got plenty of what they wanted. On the key issues in the strike -- the right to strike, health and pension benefits, safety -- the proposed contract would be a serious setback for the miners. Both the miners and the operators knew this strike was not a run-of-the-mill strike over how much more in wages or fringe benefits the workers would get. It was a fundamental conflict over power -- with the bosses attempting to qualitatively weaken the union. The principles in the proposed contract strengthen the coal operators' hand on every point. And, for all their gnashing, the mine owners would not have gotten this far were it not for the hamfisted intervention of the Carter government on their behalf.

Carter Struggles Again for Mining Union

As it is, the mine bosses got plenty of what they wanted. On the key issues in the strike -- the right to strike, health and pension benefits, safety -- the proposed contract would be a serious setback for the miners. Both the miners and the operators knew this strike was not a run-of-the-mill strike over how much more in wages or fringe benefits the workers would get. It was a fundamental conflict over power -- with the bosses attempting to qualitatively weaken the union. The principles in the proposed contract strengthen the coal operators' hand on every point. And, for all their gnashing, the mine owners would not have gotten this far were it not for the hamfisted intervention of the Carter government on their behalf.

For nearly three weeks the federal cabinet-level coal strike "task force" held nervous meetings daily in the White House to plot the government's next moves.

The problem for the federal government was that a frontal assault on the union didn't seem likely to settle anything satisfactorily. One idea was to allow miners to picket at mines, but the union leaders in two White House conferences last week, but there was little confidence that this ploy would work either. And all the politicians feared the bloody and politically explosive results of sending in the federal marshalls and Justice Department offices to be on "alert" to maintain "law and order" against the miners. A Labor-chaeflain of the AFL-CIO, George Meany, backed up by United Auto Workers president Doug Fraser, urged the government to seize the mines and order the miners back. Carter obtained virtually unanimous support for such a move from Congressional leaders in two White House conferences last week, but there was little confidence that this ploy would work either. And, for all their gnashing, the mine owners would not have gotten this far were it not for the hamfisted intervention of the Carter government on their behalf.

Carter Strongarms the Miners

For nearly three weeks the federal cabinet-level coal strike "task force" held nervous meetings daily in the White House to plot the government's next moves.

For nearly three weeks the federal cabinet-level coal strike "task force" held nervous meetings daily in the White House to plot the government's next moves.

U.S. Labor Secretary Ray Marshall
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In March of 1921 the garrison of the key fortress of Kronstadt, located on an island in the Gulf of Finland a few miles from Petrograd, revolted against the Bolshevik government. The mutineers held Kronstadt for two weeks, until the Soviet regime finally retook it by a direct assault across the ice resulting in great bloodshed on both sides. The rebels, an army of purified Soviet power freed from the monopoly of the Communists; the Bolsheviks claimed the revolt was a counterrevolutionary mutiny and that, whatever the sailors' intentions, it could only serve the White Guards.

Ever since, supporters of the Kronstadt revolt have claimed that this event provides the anti-working-class nature of the Bolshevik regime, demonstrating that there is really no significant difference between Leninism and Stalinism or, more specifically, that the latter flows naturally from the former. In fact, the Kronstadt uprising has become the center of a great myth, assiduously propagated by the anarchists but seized upon by a whole array of anti-revolutionary forces ranging from social democrats to terrorist separatists.

The principal aim of the "huck and cry over Kronstadt" is and always has been to discredit the Marxists' struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, and in particular to smear Trotskyism, the contemporary embodiment of authentic Leninism. Thus the famous pamphlet of the anarchist Ida Mett (The Kronstadt Commune [1938]) was written to deflect Trotsky's devastating critique of the Spanish anarchists' treachery in the suppression of the Barcelona May Days of 1937.

Today once again there is a growing confluence of imperialist and pseudo-leftist denunciations of the USSR. The advent of the Democratic administration of Jimmy Carter marked the ascendancy of post-Watergate liberalism in the U.S. and the attempt to refurbish the ideological credentials of American imperialism internationally. While Carter has been unable to alter the post-Vietnam world balance of power, he has busily sought to line up an unholy alliance of cold warriors and ostensible socialists behind his "human rights" crusade against the Soviet bloc. Thus it is only a matter of time until Kronstadt again becomes a rallying cry for anti-Communism, this time no doubt including a "self-criticism" by some ex-Trotskyist revisionists of the Bolsheviks' suppression of the 1921 revolt. As the fracturing Mensheviks fought against "Soviet social-imperialism", as the reformist Socialist Workers Party, propped up by the Soviet Shachtmanite and De Leonists, "Our party is your party"; as Ernest Mandel & Co. praise the "progressive features" of Eurocommunism, it falls to the international Spartanist tendency to uphold the necessary measures undertaken by the Bolshevik revolutionaries in their hour of greatest danger.

The relevant facts about the Kronstadt revolt have been assembled by a pro-anarchist scholar, Paul Avrich, in his book, Kronstadt 1921. Published in 1970 and reissued in paperback four years later, the Avrich book is qualitatively superior to all previous anti-Bolshevik Kronstadt studies, both the philistine works of liberal academics and the "leftist" tracts of such figures as Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, Anton Ciliga and Ida Mett. In the edition of Mett's pamphlet on Kronstadt produced by the anti-Leninist "Solidarity" group in Britain, the publishers "recommend in particular" Avrich's book. The well-known British periodical Anarchy devoted a special issue to Kronstadt, featuring a lengthy review of Kronstadt 1921, which while differing with some of Avrich's judgments praises its factual content in the following terms: "Kronstadt 1921 will from now on be the standard source of information about what happened at Kronstadt. The great value of the book is that it gives in one place all the significant facts about the rising, with full reference to the accessible sources...firmly establishing the rising in its various contexts."

Avrich himself contributed an introduction to this issue of Anarchy in which his political outlook is made explicit: "The Kronstadt sailors," he writes, "were revolutionary martyrs fighting to restore the idea of free soviets against the Bolshevik dictatorship, and their suppression was an act of brutality which shattered the myth that Soviet Russia was a 'workers' and peasants' state'."

We, too, strongly recommend this book to every would-be communist. For, despite his sympathies with the anti-Bolshevik rebels, Avrich has conscientiously assembled the relevant facts (while digging up some important new ones) and his book is therefore invaluable to revolutionary Marxists. If "libertarians" have drawn comfort from Kronstadt 1921, that is testimony only to their incurable political muddle-headedness and resultant incapacity to interpret the facts before their eyes.

Unrest in the Countryside, Starvation in the Cities

The Avrich book, despite its openly partisan stance toward the rebellion, provides decisive evidence that the victory of the Kronstadt uprising would have given tremendous aid to the counterrevolutionary White Guards who were lying in wait in imperialist naval and army bases ringing Red Russia. Although defeated in the civil war, the counterrevolutionaries awaited the first opportunity to pounce on a Soviet regime presiding over a famine-stricken country with its industries devastated and the rural areas rife with peasant unrest.

The events at Kronstadt are simply not comprehensible unless they are seen against the social background of Russia in 1921 and linked with the events of the preceding three years. Avrich tells it well enough: "...the winter of 1920-1921 was an extremely critical period in Soviet history. Although the military struggle had been won and the external situation was rapidly improving, the Bolsheviks faced grave internal difficulties. Russia was exhausted and bankrupt. The scars of battle were visible in every corner of the land. During the last two years the death rate had mounted sharply, famine and pestilence claiming millions of victims beyond the millions who had fallen in combat. Not since the Time of Troubles in the seventeenth century had the country seen such suffering and devastation. Agricultural output had fallen off drastically; industry and transportation were in a shambles. The time had come to bind up the nation's wounds, and for this a shift was needed in domestic policy..."
social life. Its cornerstone was the forcible seizure of grain from the peasantry. Armed detachments were used to requisition the agricultural surpluses with which to feed the cities and to provision the Red Army. Six months after the revolution, Moscow lost nearly half its prewar levels. Although published statistics vary considerably, they indicate a drop of nearly three-quarters of a million, a drop of nearly forty percent in industrial production. Moscow lost nearly half its inhabitants. The insurgents' capacities were measured in the number of days they could have survived. Yet the peasants did not simply resist the land reform. Rather, they failed to accept their new status or to obtain the satisfaction of their land hunger and the elimination of the nobility, and now they wanted only to be let in peace. Embracing themselves as the new social order, they guarded suspiciously against any outside intrusions. As the Civil War deepened and requisition teams descended into the countryside, the peasants began to regard the Bolsheviks as adversaries rather than as friends and benefactors. Yet it was the peasants, for the duration of the Civil War, continued to tolerate the Soviet regime as a lesser evil than White Rule. While White Rule accentuated their poverty for the ruling party, still more did they fear a return of the gentility and the loss of their land. The food collection squads, it is true, often met with resistance in the villages, resistance which claimed more than a few Bolshevik lives, but the peasants shrank from armed opposition on a scale sufficient to threaten the existence of the government. However, with the defeat of Wrangel's army in the fall of 1920, the situation changed rapidly. Now that the White danger had evaporated, peasant resentment declined. Flared up out of or at least with requisitioning. "Away with food requisitions. What is to be done with surpluses?" "Down with the Communists and the Jews." Beyond this, they shared a common hatred of the cities. Kronstadt 1921

For anarchists, Marxists, New Leftists and other anti-Marxists, the peasantry has no essence. There is little doubt that compulsory assignments of agricultural products from the peasant to the urban market could have functioned. Yet the peasants, the bulk of the revolution, are not a statistic. For them the annihilation of their people, the destruction of their livelihood, was more than a statistic. It was an individual and a personal experience. There may be another way of understanding the revolution. This is to ask: what is the anarchist answer to the Allied blockade, flooded coal mines, torn-up railroads and blasted bridges, etc., with the consequence that there was nothing to trade in the countryside for the metropolitan area? There was another path, he conceals this from his readers. His anarchist reviewers do not indicate it with his description of the reality that the peasants did not simply resist the land reform. Rather, the truth is that they offer no other program because they have none. The anarchist solutions are not tough enough to be solutions. The measures the Bolsheviks took to deal with the reality facing the Russian worker were realistic even to recognize that reality itself.

The Bolsheviks did not ignore the reality they faced. The revolution would have been impossible without them. Had they waited for the peasants to "willingly and generously" turn over their grain out of good will, they would have permitted the enemies of the revolution to carry on agitation behind the lines, and there "might have been no Kronstadt tragedy...because there would have been no revolutionary conquests left to defend." Rather there would have been, at best, a Petrograd Commune, drowned in blood, a subject for historicizing tendencies which be placed on the library shelves along with academic studies of Luxemburg and Ghandi, who are also subjects for sympathetic study because, after all, they lost.

The great crime of the Bolsheviks, from the viewpoint of their "democratic" critics, is that they turned the first time in history, a propertyless, oppressed class took and held power, proving in practice that the proletariat can indeed rule.

Revolt of Demoralized Elements

The Russian working class had been altered, and not for the better, by the terror and the pressure of a system which, whether used on its seizure of power. And the garrison at Kronstadt had changed too. The Kronstadt of 1921 was not the revolutionary Kronstadt of 1917 or 1905. Trotsky observed that: "In a situation faced directly by a minority. The success of a revolution is possible, however, only where this minority finds more or less support, or at least county sympathy, from a great mass of the majority. The shift in different stages of the revolution, like the transition from revolution to counterrevolution, is directly determined by changing political relations, i.e., the balance between the parties. But when has there been a revolution which was not a counterrevolutionary one, and the majority, the vanguard and the majority. The conflict of the revolutionists-and the backward ones, the laggards, the less conscious elements of the toiling masses."

International, February 1939

Perhaps the Bolsheviks brought it all about. The economic igno­

ramus Emma Goldman assures reader of her Met Disillusionments in Russia that the bolshheviks of 1917 were not "willingly and generously" until the brutal bolshiv­

kists, apparently out of sheer malice, dissolved the peasant Soviets and left the peasants' grain to rot. (The under­

standing she displays about the psychol­

ogy of the Russian peasant is matched by her description of Russians in general are "capable of almost anything except sustained morality" This she does not, however, blame on the Bolsheviks, who are to blame for everything else.) Other "liberarian" critics have had 50 years now to give us their views on this question: what is the anarchist answer to
were to the sultanate of Oman to counter the guerrilla insurgency there. Cold warriors in Washington have also gone on the warpath over the massive Soviet military intervention in the Horn. National security warrior Zbigniew Brzezinski has been most strident, arguing that the U.S. must consider all options for directly confronting the Russians in the Horn and elsewhere in Africa. In recent weeks Brzezinski has become more openly critical of the so-called "keep cool" Africa policy associated with President Carter's black front man Andrew Young.

Among the black African states absolutely no sympathy exists for the Somalis. Regardless of their sometimes deplorable actions, they see the "danger of Soviet penetration," the member states of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in their majority regard Somalia as the "aggressor" in Ethiopia. If the members of the OAU can agree on nothing else, they can agree on the "principle" of the "inviolability of borders.

Until Somalia, which is ethnically homogeneous, all (or black-rulled countries in sub-Saharan Africa are composed of a single people or ethnic group (and more often than not of a crazy-quilt patchwork). Since the European colonialists drew their borders with an eye to "divide and rule," a single tribe or people often has been dismembered and divided among several neighboring states, one country, two or more. History's archetypal "tribal" conflict has often been forestalled by the "tribal" factor. Recurrent tribalism and secessionism have been the legacy of the colonial division of Africa. But the boundaries that were imposed then have emerged in the process of "decolonization" are incapable of solving the elementary problems of the countries: of national integration and the harmonious and just resolution of intercommu­ nal or tribalist conflicts. No matter how irrational or unjust, these borders are enshrined as sacrosanct by this OAU.

Given the deeply rooted opposition of the OAU to the Somali claims over the eastern third of Ethiopia, the northern province of Somaliland, the Carter administration so far has refrained from openly providing Somalia with military or economic support. The Carter administration has implicitly acknowledged that any military aid to Somalia would very likely be used to attack Ethiopia, its chief U.S. client such as Saudi Arabia or the Shah of Iran.

Meanwhile, the U.S. has sought to put diplomatic pressure on the Soviets to force them to circumscribe their role. Shortly after the Soviet military counteroffensive was mounted Carter warned Boris Ponomarev, head of a visiting delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet, that expanded Russian or Cuban military involvement in the Horn of Africa would adversely affect prospects for ratification of any new strategic arms limitation agreement or the joint discussions over military presence in the Indian Ocean. And in mid-February Brzezinski's deputy, David Aaron, headed up a high-level American diplomatic mission to Addis Ababa where secret meetings produced a Russian pledge that the Ethiopian war would not be widened if the U.S. agreed not to arm Somalia.

For Marcys, the massive Soviet military intervention on the side of its blood-stained clients in Addis Ababa does not alter the least fundamentally reactionary character of the Derg and its brutal policies of national oppression. On the contrary, by rushing military aid to the Ethiopian army the Russian and Cuban forces in Ethiopia become its direct ally in grinding the rebellion suppressed oppress­ ing minority peoples into bloody submission. Already the Soviet military intervention has enabled the Ethiopian air force to intensify its truly genocidal terror bombing of civilian sites in Eritrea. Towns which in the past have not been the targets for the deadly raids of the Ethiopian air force have been blanketed with napalm and high explosive-personnel bombs. Of course, the Mogadishu regime would have been a legitimate struggle. An insurrection limited to Russian civilians has been forced to flee their razed villages and smoldering huts and to trek to the safety of the south Sudan, where one million Eritrean refugees (one third of the population) now live in squalid camps. And similar methods of "pacification" can be expected during and after the Ethiopian retreat from the Ogaden, where even now the scorched-earth policy of the Ethiopians has included air attacks on anything that moves across the Ogaden desert, including camels (which outnumber the Ogaden nomads by severalfold).

especially now, Marxists must champion the elementary democratic right of the oppressed tribes and peoples of Ethiopia to political secession. As long as Ethiopia remains a "prison house of peoples" (as Lenin dubbed the tsarist empire), the development of proletarian and socialist consciousness among the toilers will be poisoned by chauvinism on the part of the oppressor of Ambarsas and petty-bourgeois national­ ism among the multiplicity of oppressed peoples. Thus, we call for the military victory of the anti-junta forces fighting in Eritrea and the Ogaden against the Ethiopian army. Although the latter is spearheaded by Russian and Cuban units, this fact is not central.

At the same time, however, Marxists warn against placing the slightest political confidence in any of these nationalist, tribalist or feudalist insur­ gent forces. In Eritrea, which is the most cultured and economically advanced province of Ethiopia, each of the rival guerrilla groups aspires to political power with an outlook not qualitatively different from that of Idris Amin in the period of his rise to power. Each of the three groups has demonstrated that, if militarily victorious, it would seek to establish bonapartist rule by wipping out its rivals. Again and again the uneasy truces between these guerrilla forces has exploded in all-out fratricidal bloodlet­ ting, the most recent only last month. It is not difficult to imagine what kind of "people's democracies" these parties would bring to Eritrea. They are akin to the Ethiopian junta out of power, but militarily victorious, it would seek to establish bonapartist rule by wiping out its rivals.

The Samalis of the Ogaden region were incorporated into the Ethiopian empire in 1896. The British ceded that section of their Somaliland to the Emperor Menelik in return for his promise not to aid the Mahdist rebellion in the Sudan. Thus, unlike the Eritreans, the Somali people of the Ogaden historically have fought not to form an independent state in the Ogaden but rather to merge with the Somali republic. As a result of successive partitions and annexations, the Somali people today are divided between four distinct state entities. In addition to the Democratic Republic, the eastern third of Ethiopia (comprising the provinces of Ogaden, Bana Daras and Hararghe), the Northern Frontier District of Kenya together hold more than half of the Somali people, while about half of the population of the tiny former French territory of Djibouti is populated by Somali-related people, the Issas.

Historically the goal of Somali nationalism has been to recreate "Great Somaliland" through merging the present Somali Democratic Republic with the "lost territories." Even today maps printed in Somalia show the "lost territories" as part of the republic, and recognition of "Greater Somalia" is written into the state constitution.

When Somalia was able to score some significant military successes inside Ethiopia last summer (notably, cutting the rail line connecting Addis Ababa with its sole commercial outlet, Djibouti), Somali leader Barre recognized the vulnerability of the Ethiopians in the vast Ogaden plains. The massive Soviet army forces behind the Ogaden insur­ gents. Of course, the Mogadishu regime denied direct Soviet military interven­ tion so as not to provoke the OAU. But it was clear that Somalia had militarily intervened to threaten the Ogaden under its control.

In the aftermath of last summer's Somali invasion of Ethiopia"s Ogaden province of the war, in part as follows, "There must be a democratic right of the Somali people in Kenya, Ethiopia and Djibouti to reunite with Somalia. However, on the current fighting (in which the efficient Russian-trained Somali forces against the Ogaden) this issue is subordinated to the reality of a war over territory between two equally reactionary, capi­ talist states.

"Marx and Mengistu," W F No. 180, 4 November 1977
The Horn of Africa

Thus with the South African invasion in November 1975 and the Cuban counterevasion of 1976, the Angolan conflict became essentially internationalized. South Africa is both an ally of U.S. imperialism and a local imperialist power in its own right. At stake was the threat of a transformation of Angola into a de facto South African colony and a bastion of the American sphere of influence in Africa. The tribalist interests of Roberto’s FNLA and Saximbi’s UNITA had become subordinated to the imperialist conflict of Angola and Angolans had become the arena of a proxy war between U.S. imperialism and the Soviet degenerated workers’ state. With this fundamental change in the character of the war, our position became one of military support to the Cuban/ MPLA forces against the American-backed South African offensive (see “Stop Imperialist Drive on Luanda!”). The war over Ogaden is fundamentally different from both the first and second phases of the Angolan conflict. Somalia is not seeking to conquer the Ethiopian state and dominate the Amhara people, and in any case is ethnically related to the Somalis (the Afars, who are not Somali and in fact are ethnic relatives of the Somalis). Somalia’s Siad Barre curries favor with the USSR and its loyal supporters “discovered” that Somalia’s “reactionary” Somali “aggressors” had less to lose. Without a foothold in Ethiopia, Somalia would appearto be the easiest thing in the world. But given the international response to Selassie’s fall at the hands of a military junta which proceeded to attack the Somali regime, Barre is unlikely to risk again the international response to the Soviet-backed Somali “aggression.”
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Stalinists Spin Over “Progressive” Generals

For Stalinists of either the pro-Moscow or pro-Peking variety, finding the correct side in a political conflict would appear to be the easiest thing in the world. In the Angolan war, however, the poor Stalinists seem to be having a devil of a time in the struggles of the Angolan proletariat and Pan-Africanists, which are by no means of a “progressive” character. “But the poor Stalinists seem to be having a devil of a time in the struggle for the Angolan liberation. And no wonder. Not only do all the peoples claim to be progressive, but from the point of view of the Kremlin and the Chinese, the struggle is which is the beginning of the socialist revolution.”

Before its criminal alliance with U.S. imperialism, Peking opposed the Angolan regime, and in fact, only recently was it providing aid to Eritrean guerrillas. After 1971, however, the Chinese shifted their policy of supporting the opposition in Angola, and in 1976, the Somali regime, Fundamentally, it is in the Chinese perception of the “Lion of Judah,” who had furnished Ethiopians troops for imperialist interventions into the Congo and Korea, was hailed for his contributions “to the promotion of the cause of anti-imperialism in Asia and Africa.”

Sellers’ fall at the hands of a military junta which proceeded to attack the Somali regime, Barre is unlikely to risk again the international response to the Soviet-backed Somali “aggression.”

The Horn of Africa

Thus with the South African invasion in November 1975 and the Cuban counteroffensive, the Angolan conflict became essentially internationalized. South Africa is both an ally of U.S. imperialism and a local imperialist power in its own right. At stake was the threat of a transformation of Angola into de facto South African colony and a bastion of the American sphere of influence in Africa. The tribalist interests of Roberto's FNLA and Saximbi's UNITA had become subordinated to the imperialist conflict of Angola and Angolans had become the arena of a proxy war between U.S. imperialism and the Soviet degenerated workers' state. With this fundamental change in the character of the war, our position became one of military support to the Cuban/MPLA forces against the American-backed South African offensive (see "Stop Imperialist Drive on Luanda!"). The war over Ogaden is fundamentally different from both the first and second phases of the Angolan conflict. Somalia is not seeking to conquer the Ethiopian state and dominate the Amhara people, and in any case is ethnically related to the Somalis (the Afars, who are not Somali and in fact are ethnic relatives of the Somalis). Somalia's Siad Barre curries favor with the USSR and its loyal supporters "discovered" that Somalia's "reactionary" Somali "aggressors" had less to lose. Without a foothold in Ethiopia, Somalia would appear to be the easiest thing in the world. But given the international response to Selassie's fall at the hands of a military junta which proceeded to attack the Somali regime, Barre is unlikely to risk again the international response to the Soviet-backed Somali "aggression."
level leadership there is no one presenting a class-struggle program for victory. In fact, most of the prominent leaders have been as just as quick to run to the bosses’ government that constitutes the gravest threat to this strike.

The Distrct 11 EB member Donald Lawley grabbed media attention for a while by denouncing Miller, “voting” P & M contract that served as the pattern-setter for the BCOA pact. Illinois District 12 president Ernest Davie was put on the negotiating team, bought a new white shirt and headed off to the White House. As one Bargaining Council member told WV, “Seems like Davies changed overnight after his trip to the White House.” It was Davie who provided the government with its key breakthrough. After prolonged secret negotiations with a non-BCOA company and local officials, masterminded by the Media- tion Service and the miners, an agreement was announced with the Pittsburgh and Midway Coal Company, a subsidiary of Gulf Oil Corporation. The Labor Department immediately seized on the P&M agreement and started bonusing it in a pattern-setter” for the BCOA. On Wednesday, February 22, Labor Department pressure convinced the Bargaining Council, which had approved the P&M agreement by a 25-13 vote, to submit it to the BCOA as the “bottom-line” it would accept for a national contract.

The Carfenter government was in a jam. Just as earnestly as the coal operators, it wanted iron-clad sanctions against coal field strikes to prevent uninsured production for its coal-oriented energy policy. But the federal government was also very much concerned to secure executive and coal-state politicians who wanted an early end to the strike. Sensing the dilemma, the trade union capitalist class, the Carfenter administration put the squeeze on both the union and the BCOA to accept the P&M contract. Now with his TV announcement, well publicized prayers and threats of a new “sit in” by workers, he tried to make this take-away contract down the miners’ throats.

The coal miners do not lack perseverance, determination and valor. What they lack is a leadership willing to stand up to the federal government and coal and operators and say: No!

The miners must reject the sellout pact being offered them. Their next step must be to demand the convening of a special convention to elect a bargaining team willing to fight for their most essential demands: the right to strike, full benefits, high and equalized pensions, the right to a safe job. It takes only five UMW districts to convene such a convention. UMW victors must elect district-wide strike committees to force such a convention.

Just as important, the miners must not be allowed to stand alone as we come down to the crunch in this crucial strike. All labor has a stake in the coal strike! If the miners, the most militant and combative section of the U.S. working class, are allowed to be beaten down, the rest of the American proletariat will suffer for it. Though some of the guided leaders of the trade unions stabilize the miners in the back by promoting federal strikebreaking measures, there are thousands upon thousands of workers who are looking to the miners strike as a proof that it is possible to fight the bosses and the government and win.

An example came from the January 26 meeting of the United Steelworkers (USWA) Local 65 at U.S. Steel’s South Chicago plant in Chicago. Miners from Harlan County, Kentucky, drove 12 hours to get to the meeting. Besieged

Lou Cornett, a leading militant of the Brookieide Women’s Club in the 1974 Harlan strike, appealed to the assembled steelworkers: “We need you to do more than send money or speak to the press. We’d like the steelworkers to come out and join us.” Stressing that a steel strike now, in the face of mass layoffs, would benefit the steelworkers as well as the miners, Cornett said the miners needed the steelworkers support or they “would be set back 30 years.”

For three weeks before, a group of Local 65 militants had raised the same call for a joint strike. Wild cheers and applause greeted the appeal. The steelworker rank and file must take up the miners’ call, repudiate the union bosses’ no-strike pledge and strike in defense of their own and the miners’ needs.

If the government dares to invoke the strikebreaking Taft-Hartley law on the miners, seizes the mines or runs troops into the coal fields, general protest strikes must be the labor movement’s response. The miners urgently need powerful solidarity action! Against their do-nothing misleaders, transport and rail workers must refuse to handle scab coal. Steel must be shut down. And the entire labor movement must rise up in protest at any attempt to smash the miners’ independent mass strike. The coal miners are in the forefront of all U.S. labor. Victory to the Miners Strike!
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Red Army soldiers take positions on ice during attack on rebelling Kronstadt

The reviewer of Avrich's book in Anarchy magazine rhapsodizes over the Kronstadt mutineers as expressing "revolutionary class-consciousness of the Russian proletariat at its peak." Stationed anoutlying Kronstadt fortress (who simultaneously throws some light into an open and conscious alliance with the leaders of the revolt fled to Finland after being defeated at Kronstadt.}

And in the one mainland mutiny in 1921 will learn that:
1) A few months before the revolt its principal leader attempted to join the Whites but was turned down.
2) A few weeks before the revolt a White agent stationed near the base sent his headquarters a detailed report on the mutiny to the Whites had recruited a group of sailors on the inside who were preparing to take an active role in a forthcoming uprising there.
3) The principal leader of the revolt (the would-be White recruit) did in fact play an important role in turning a mass protest meeting into a decisive break with the Bolshevik government.
4) After being defeated at Kronstadt, the leaders of the revolt fled to Finland where they entered into an open and conscious alliance with the Communists. The joint program agreed to the establishment of a "temporary military dictatorship" after the Bolsheviks had been overthrown. These facts blow to smithereens the anarchist myth of "revolutionary Kronstadt" rising up against "Bolshevik dictatorship" and fully vindicate the decision of the Communist government to retake the mutinous garrison by force.

The social and political character of the Kronstadt mutiny can be discerned from the following considerations:
1) The mutiny was not directed against the Bolshevik government per se, but rather against the central government as a whole, which was perceived as undemocratic and repressive.
2) The mutiny was supported by a broad base of workers and sailors, who were dissatisfied with the Bolshevik government's policies and its failure to address their economic grievances.
3) The mutiny was not a spontaneous outbreak, but rather a planned and well-organized event, involving significant numbers of workers and sailors.
4) The mutiny was not a reaction to a specific event, but rather a culmination of a long-standing process of political and economic discontent with the Bolshevik government.
5) The mutiny was not a mass uprising, but rather a carefully planned and coordinated action by a small group of militants.

The Kronstadt mutiny was a significant event in Russian history, and it is important to understand its social and political character in order to assess its significance and its impact on the development of the Russian Revolution.
Over the last few years the power balance in the Horn of Africa has shifted about as unpredictably as the sands of its desert wastelands. Once dominating the international African region through its client Ethiopia, U.S. imperialism was frozen out by the “Marxist-Leninist” military dictatorship which came to power after the collapse of the imperial monarchy of emperor Haile Selassie. For nearly two decades, its toehold in black Africa restricted to “Islamic socialist” Somalia, the Soviet Union quickly jumped into Ethiopia. That it was sliding into political chaos and trouble last summer when Somalia decided that the time was ripe to annex the Somali-populated areas under the domination of its historic foe Ethiopia. Preferring neither to fight nor to switch, the Soviet Union attempted to straddle the conflict in between, resting on an often mutinous military, the Ethiopian junta headed by that latter-day Chien Kai-shek, Colony Mengistu Haile Mariam, has mounted an escalating campaign of savage mass murder of political opponents, in particular even suspected sympathizers of the underground Guevarist Ethiopians. (quoted in the pro-government rally in Addis Ababa.

Pro-government rally in Addis Ababa.

Soviet military advisers in the Somali capital.

Over the last few years events have been taking a turn in the Horn. When the Ethiopian army proved too feeble to stop the Somali seizure of the Ogaden, (the once elite Third Division mutinied in September and allowed the key town of Jijiga to be taken without a fight) the Kremlin decided that its Ethiopian sphere of influence was to be much of a sphere at all, then a massive military intervention would be necessary.

Beginning several months ago but increasing dramatically during the last few weeks, military hardware and personnel from the Soviet bloc have flown an estimated several thousand bomb and strafe advanced Somali positions between the ancient walled citadel of Harar and Babile, a militarily strategic town 25 miles to the east along the main (and only) road leading to Jigjiga and the Somalia border beyond. On the ground tanks and motorized artillery units were driven simultaneously eastward from the highlands down into the barren Ogaden. The Somalis have been dislodged from their positions around Hararr and the hamlet of Falmehro but have dug into the jagged ridges and boulder-strewn ravines of the Ahmar mountains flanking the main road to Jigjiga. Reports these bunkers have provided the Somali forces with sufficient cover from the air attacks and artillery barrages that they have been able to hold their ground and even stop the Ethiopian advance, at least for the moment.

Just how long the Somali forces can hold their own in the Ogaden remains to be seen. What is certain is that Somalia does not have the military capacity to be an equal match for the Russian/Cuban-led Ethiopian counteroffensive. When the Ogaden campaign was launched last July, Somalia had an estimated 300 tanks today only 30 reportedly remain in action. Likewise, only nine of its original force of 52 MiG fighters are operational, while all 11 of its helicopters have been put out of commission. From the outset of the Russian/Cuban-led Ethiopian counteroffensive, Somali president Muhammad Siad Barre has sought to internationalize the conflict. To the pro-Western Arab states and Iran, Barre has warned that an Ethiopian victory in the Ogaden would enable the Derg (junta) to concentrate its vastly more powerful forces on reconquering Eritrea—which, if successful, would open the strategic Red Sea ports of Massawa and Asmara to the Soviets. To the U.S. imperialists Barre portrays expanded Russian presence in the Horn of Africa as an immediate threat to world peace. “If the Russians are not thrown out of this region, the third world war could break out” (quoted in Time, Feb. 27, 1978).

In response, the Saudi Arabians have already bankrolled arms purchases by Somalia; most recently, Saudi oil money bought 43 Cobra helicopter gunships from the U.S., to be delivered to Somalia through Spain. Moreover, Egypt has indicated its readiness to send some of its aging Soviet-supplied tanks, while the Shah of Iran has dispatched a team of military advisers to Somalia to determine whether Iranian forces should be sent to the Ogaden as they continued on page 8.