Workers Must Lead Iranian Revolution!

Down With the Shah! Down With the Mullahs!

Oil Workers Strike Paralyzes Economy

NOVEMBER 17: Iran is at the breaking point as a massive wave of popular hostility has combined with a concerted Islamic offensive to bring the shah's regime to its knees. But the opposition to its dominance has not come from the clerical clique called "the mullahs" and mass demonstrations under the leadership of the absolute Muslim religious hierarchy, clamoring for the introduction of an "Islamic" state.

Nest House staged its first oil miners demonstrations on the September 8 labor holiday massacre in Teheran, 1978. Since then, mass demonstrations during which every section of the population has taken part. This country, it is said, has returned to the only remaining base of power domestically, the army. With the imposition of a military regime, headed by General Gholam Reza Azhari, the imperial murder on the Peacock Throne hopes to check the rapid disintegration of the regime's authority which has escalated dramatically over the last month.

Only the strength of the military has kept the shah in power this long. Repeated demonstrations by crowds numbering in the hundreds of thousands have left Teheran strewn with rubble, barricades and wrecked cars and troop transports. The universities have been transformed into hotbeds of agitation by Muslim and leftist students. The barracks remain closed, with artisants and shopkeepers attendant to the signals of the exiled high holymans of White Islam, Ayatollah Khomeini.

But it is the workers' strikes which have brought the political climate in Iran to the fever point. Hundreds of thousands of state employees and teachers remain out on strike in political opposition to the shah. On October 31 Iran's 37,000 oil workers staged a sit-down strike and have defiantly withstood government threats and direct military attack in demanding the release of political prisoners, the firing of corrupt officials and the expulsion of foreign supervisors. Iran's oil production under management and troop operation of the wells is down to 1.5 million barrels a day from a normal figure of 6.5 million barrels.

With these oil flow threatened and their local Ushin in danger, the imperialists have closed ranks around the butcher-shah. Gone are the heart-rending cries of the bourgeois press for the violation of "human rights" in Iran. Carter rushed to endorse the Azhari cabinet and, of course, added his vacuous praise of the shah's "liberalizations." The press has been unanimous in endorsing the shah's rule, raising the sole criticism that perhaps he has lately been too lenient with the opposition. Even the Wall Street Journal has been publishing articles warning about the current state of world oil supplies sharply affected by the strike.

As we go to press, the news reports the arrest of strike leaders, army occupation of the refineries and fierce resistance by the workers to this attempt to finally crush the strike. As the imperialists and the shah prepare for a showdown with the proletariat and as the mullahs cast about for the military leader who will establish the "just rule of Islam," the program of revolutionary Trotskyists becomes all the more urgent.

Victory to the Strikers! Down with the Shah! Down with the Mullahs! For Proletarian Revolution in Iran!

Teheran Is Burning!

The immediate catalyst for summoning the generals to power was the massive rebellion which raged through the streets of Teheran on November 4 and 5. The previous week the regime had moved to shut down the universities in an abortive attempt to prevent a planned week of student protests on behalf of the victims of the shah's white terror. This only served to further influence the students and Teheran University was reopened on November 29.

High school students in the capital demonstrated against the exile of the anti-shah Muslim leader Ayatollah Haji-Bahai and Ayatollah Falahabadi and Ayatollah Khomeini. On November 4, joined by students from the university, they then marched on the house of Ayatollah Yazdi, another prominent opponent of the regime recently released from prison. At the gates of Teheran University the mullahs toppled a bronze statue of the shah. Imperial troops then moved in to disperse the crowd and opened fire, killing dozens of students.

The following day hundreds of thousands of enraged demonstrators attacked and sacked stores, banks and government offices. In addition to four hours, the Ministry of "Information" was burned and the shah's propaganda chief shot and beaten. Tanks presented the protesters from storming the U.S. embassy after they had crashed through the iron gates of the British embassy and fired on them. On Monday the new government declared that all "inciters" would be rounded up and that the soldiers would gun down any gathering of more than two persons. Troops continued on page 11.

Students confront riot police at Teheran University during recent anti-shah protests.

Abbas/ Gamma-Lyon
Union Saved, Jobs Slashed

The 88-day-old New York City newspaper strike ended early Saturday with a settlement which, while far from the Washington Post-style union-busting defeat on which the union leaders would have liked to leave the Presstimen's Union with an estimated 30 percent fewer members by 1984, was a clear victory. But the joint settlement revealed an important new turning point for the industry, and the solidarity, precautions as it was, of the other printing-union members throughout the industry. The acceptance of job losses through attrition by the New York Daily News, the failure of any significant mass of unions to stand together, and the futility of the mass support of single-plant strikes without a resolute struggle on the part of the union leaders, was clear that the other unions were on the defensive, while Murdoch's New York Times was bigger and more profitable than ever. The threat which the strike faced, the strike against the three dailies into an industry-wide strike to organize the unorganized and low-wage trades and union standards to a uniform high

Jane Margolis Wins 42 Percent in Plant

Militant Action Caucus Wins Big in S.F. Phone

SAN FRANCISCO, November 1--In what was reportedly the largest turnout ever for a local Communications Workers of America (CWA) Local, a Militant Action Caucus (MAC) candidate has resonantly been elected as the new president of Local 9415. Jane Margolis, 272 votes represented a powerful 42 percent of union members who voted in the plant, placing her second in a field of 13 candidates.

The election itself was marked by the dumping of many incumbents, who were rightly identified by one union official as rent control candidates which the union membership has suffered. Local president Jack Whitehouse, running for his third term in a three-way race, finished last with under 200 votes. Jack Dempsey, whose clique has actually controlled the local for the last three years, with only 150 votes, was also defeated, losing to Jim Imerle. Significantly, the MAC vote not only beat out 65 phone workers who "bullheaded" their ballots, voting only for Margolis for executive board. Indeed, local secretary Z. M. Goldberg represented a core of militants who are not only fed up with do-nothing union bureaucrats, but have long opposed MAC as the only force in the local determined to wage a militant struggle against the company. Thus, the election was the second election within a year in which MAC has been victorious, demonstrating the determination of the membership following within the membership.

Margolis, who is a former executive board member in the plant, is the CWU Local 9415, told the Examiner that even compared to her successful campaign for convention delegate this April, MAC's vote totals increased substantially. She pointed out that the company has not historically even recognized them in recent months, and that there is a broad mood of anger in the local. MAC has fought to mobilize the union in response. When the local leadership sat out on its hands and management fired last fall, the company was then forced to rehire the workers demanding that Margolis be appointed shop steward was blocked by the bureaucracy. The Democrats, as strike action to win a shorter workweek at an cut in pay, nationalization of all phone lines, and compensation, for black defense guards to the latest suicide, and a campus political force, for black and health care for a cure for leprosy.

In its several-year history in the plant, the Bay, Mac has been without locals whose names are not hyphenated and something like a contagious disease.

Meanwhile, of the 50th militant oppositions in the CWA have been driven out, or datrusted by demoralized, or simply been disconnected by false policies. Thus in the Local 9410, two elections were lost this year, and that there is a fundamental difference between the 1975 Militant Action candidates.

In the election for MAC candidates, Jane Margolis, a proven fighter to the local 9415, was elected to the executive board. Jane had run on a platform of defense campaign. With the stewards and others who have run on the same slates in the past, there is no fundamental difference between the two militants. For a militant, fighting union, for a militant, fighting against the union, to support the strikebreaking Democratic Party. "I am for money to build a stronger, militant union, as that is the only way to maintain and build a phone company," explained Jane Margolis.

Jane, the current leader of the local, is a former executive board member in the plant, is the CWU Local 9415, told the Examiner that even compared to her successful campaign for convention delegate this April, MAC's vote totals increased substantially. She pointed out that the company has not historically even recognized them in recent months, and that there is a broad mood of anger in the local. MAC has fought to mobilize the union in response. When the local leadership sat out on its hands and management fired last fall, the company was then forced to rehire the workers demanding that Margolis be appointed shop steward was blocked by the bureaucracy. The Democrats, as strike action to win a shorter workweek at an cut in pay, nationalization of all phone lines, and compensation, for black defense guards to the latest suicide, and a campus political force, for black and health care for a cure for leprosy.

In its several-year history in the plant, the Bay, Mac has been without locals whose names are not hyphenated and something like a contagious disease.

Meanwhile, of the 50th militant oppositions in the CWA have been driven out, or datrusted by demoralized, or simply been disconnected by false policies. Thus in the Local 9410, two elections were lost this year, and that there is a fundamental difference between the 1975 Militant Action candidates.

In the election for MAC candidates, Jane Margolis, a proven fighter to the local 9415, was elected to the executive board. Jane had run on a platform of defense campaign. With the stewards and others who have run on the same slates in the past, there is no fundamental difference between the two militants. For a militant, fighting union, for a militant, fighting against the union, to support the strikebreaking Democratic Party. "I am for money to build a stronger, militant union, as that is the only way to maintain and build a phone company," explained Jane Margolis.
Daughrty vs. Koch: Feud in the Democratic Party

On November 6 some 500 predominantly black protesters streamed across the Brooklyn Bridge on their way to the concrete canyons of Wall Street chanting “We’re Fired Up. Can’t Take No More!” The marchers were celebrating Black Solidarity Day. In the front lines many carried pictures of Arthur Miller, the black continuity leader whose strangulation-killing by the cops last summer was the catalyst which brought the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn to flashpoint.

The demonstration had a militancy, at least in the collection of Herbert Daughtry. The Brooklyn Borough President was not only a black activist, he was a socialist. “I’m ‘sophistication’ in not even first bloom,” Daughtry said in an interview. “But he praised the Ballard G.O. saying that it was a good move. ‘Visibly, clearly,’ Sam Pinn. along with the industrialists ‘come to lie down. I just signed a contract to insure the day care center in black neighborhoods. That’s not the way for blacks to begin but it is a way to be an active part of an ongoing struggle for the Koch.’

It was predictable that the Koch administration would respond by a long silence. But a long silence was not long enough for the Koch “reform” black mayor. “I have a computerized lottery system and that is one of the ways to bring in the blacks-clear—their voices to the struggle to ‘put a black mayor in City Hall.’” Finally, a rather subdued Daughtry finished off the evening asserting it was time for blacks to begin to “run our own candidates.”

Black Democrats vs. the Jewish Mayor

The present lurch-up of black Democrats against the Koch administration began forming last winter, soon after the mayor’s inauguration. Koch, the epitome of the 1960’s “reform Democrat,” rode into office last year on the creed of a racist backlash with his advocacy of the death penalty and echoing the vicious “Night of the Animals” press hysteria which followed the July 1977 Black-out. Nevertheless, after making the point that they carried some electoral clout by running out-going Manhattan borough president Percy Sutton in the primary, the black Democrats totally swung their support to Koch. But, like the AFL-CIO, bureaucrats who had the key labor vote of Carter only to the left, the black politicians have been screaming “betrayal.”

But Koch had made his two-point program—get the agitos and get the blacks—clear from the beginning. Once in office he simply proceeded to carry it out. Declaring all-out war on what he called the “poorwicemen” he began wholesale firings of black administrators and a massive “reorganization” of the poverty programs themselves.

With all Koch’s ranting about “getting tough” with welfare chiselers it was no surprise that the first blow-up with the black Democratic leaders came over his appointment of Blanche Ballard Bernstein to head the city’s Human Resources Administration. Bernstein quickly distinguished herself as the first welfare commissioner ever to come out against an increase in welfare. Next came the forced resignation of Koch’s human rights commissioner, Patricia Nieto-Ortiz, when she insisted on reviewing the city’s own record of minority hiring. And on April 6 black ministers sat at Koch’s office demanding more summer jobs for youths. Koch promptly ordered the cops to haul them off to the slammer.

Following these preliminaries Koch proceeded to his next two of the big poverty programs. He simply canceled the city’s $4 million contribution to the Addiction Services Agencies. Then he “reorganized” the snark mission in federal funds out of the Model Cities program while drastically cutting back its state funds. At one point 90 percent of the program was doomed. Shortly afterwards a second important black leader, Harlem Congressman Charles B. Rangel and State Senator McCall (another featured speaker at Daughtry’s rally) took Koch to court to try to stop any more “reorganization” of the city’s poverty programs.

In an article, “Black Leaders Sue to Stop Koch Move,” reporting on the Rangel-McCall suit the New York Times (May 25) commented on what it called the “rapidly growing, deep antagonism between the Mayor and an important segment of the city’s black leadership.” And in an editorial directed to the earlier mentioned blacks the black leaders cited a Koch plan to distribute federally funded youth jobs through a computerized lottery system instead of through the black churches, as well as complaints about the Mayor’s lilypads “Silk Stocking” district inner circle. But to these charges mayoral spokesmen replied:

“Under previous administrations, the Mayor’s people, black leaders—and particularly their antipoverty programs—have been made part of the political clubbism system and that these leaders are now upset at the loss of money, jobs and prestige.”

As the months progressed the feud between the black pols and Koch found its most acute note at the height of the Black United Front (B.U.F.) demonstrations. As in opposition between the liberal muckraking Village Voice and the black liberal Amsterdam News, with Percy Sutton a 37 percent stockholder, it was predictable that the black mayor would have to choose between the Voice and Koch’s moves against the poverty programs. But the sparks really started to fly when Jack Newfield’s April 10 article, “Amsterdam News Sells Out Harlem,” documented the paper’s surrender to the massive personal stake in the city’s poverty programs.

Thus, according to Newfield, “Amsterdam News ad man Al Vava and his wife and child were tenants in a black-owned apartment in the Newfield building. Black United Front (B.U.F.) was a partner in the insurance-brokering firm which held a $10 million city contract to insure the day care centers. Head Start centers, senior citizens’ huts and so forth. And the chairman of the board of directors, John Edmonds, was (Newfield alleged) up until 1973 director of Harlem Model Cities, as well as attorney for the $5 million federally funded corruption-ridden United Harlem Dreightners.

The Amsterdam News counterattacked the next week, saying that the Murphy-owned Village Voice was in no position to sling mud. Newfield and the rest of the white leftists at the Voice, said this black policy man shuns jobs and the Koch’s hands with their expenses. A 15 April article, “Newfield: Apologist for Koch” railed.

Why has the Amsterdam News come under such vicious and unprincipled attack by the liberal left? Mr. Newfield is concerned about the Mayor’s ‘com­ mendable’ plan for reorganizing the antipoverty program. He protests that the Amsterdam News understands the implications of this program, that no new redistribution of all federal funds for New York City’s poor will be made by the Mayor’s superfund program to help the urban underprivileged, but the Koch.”

Flashpoint

In the midst of the brawling patronage battle on the Bridge one man was strangled to death by the cops, a WORKERS VANGUARD
particularly gruesome crime even for the
"guardians of law and order" who regularly
shoot young black men and women in the
street in the presence of police. Miller was an
active Democratic Party politician and
friend of the black community. The Crown
Heights neighborhood had long been a
center of political activity for the black
community.

On October 25 a Brooklyn grand
jury refused to return a murder
indictment against a Jewish man who
was accused of killing two blacks in a
bar
fight. The man, a member of a
recently formed black community
organization, was granted bail and
released from jail.

The scene was set for an increase in
tension between the two communities.

The next day, the New York City
mayor, John Lindsay, held a press
conference to announce the murder
indictment and to urge
reconciliation between the two
communities.

Lindsay charged that the murder
was the result of a "lack of
tolerance on the part of both
communities." He called for
reconciliation and urged both
communities to work together for a
better future.

The murder was followed by a series
of incidents in which blacks were
attacked by white mobs in the
neighborhoods of Crown Heights and
Clinton Hill. The police were
witnessed to be complicit in the
attacks, and there were reports of
police brutality.

In the face of increased violence,
the mayor ordered the deployment of
federal troops to the neighborhood.

The troops were sent in to
"protect the peace," but they were
also used to break up community
protests and to remove black
activists from the area.

The protests continued for several
weeks, with black and white
activists both demanding justice
for the murder victim and calling for
an end to police brutality.

On November 17, a group of black
activists marched in protest, carrying
signs that read "Justice for Malcolm
X." The march was met with violent
attacks by white mobs, and several
people were injured.

The following day, more than 100
black protesters were arrested in a
massive police raid on the Crown
Heights neighborhood.

The protests continued for several
weeks, with black and white
activists both demanding justice
for the murder victim and calling for
an end to police brutality.

The situation remained tense for
months, with occasional violence
between the two communities.

Eventually, the neighborhood began
to return to normal, but the
protests had left a lasting
impact, with both the black and
white communities working to
heal the wounds of the
violence.

Remember this Tradition?

Once a flagship of the socialist
movement in the United States, the
Vancouver Express was the main
vehicle for the radical struggle of the
working class. The Express was
founded in 1973 and began publication
in 1974.

The Express was a bi-weekly
newspaper, distributed in
Vancouver and the surrounding
area. It was published by the
Vancouver Socialist Movement, a
branch of the Socialist Workers
Party.

The Express was a forum for
radical political analysis and
discussion. It was a place for
activists to organize and
educate themselves about the
social and economic issues of the
day.

The Express was also a
platform for the Vancouver
Socialist Movement's campaign
to fight for a socialist society.

The Express was not afraid to
speak truth to power. It was a
voice for the voiceless, and a
source of hope for the
oppressed.

The Express was a
magnitude, and its legacy lives on
in the struggle for a better world.

Vancouver's Labor Newspaper

Here is some welcome news from
Canada's Pacific coast—a labor
battle in which the workers haven't
stood up with their hands in their
back pockets. In New York the
leaders of the press unions' union
from the beginning agreed to
maneuvering and argued only over how
many jobs should be lost. But in
Vancouver, the union is fighting
to protect its jobs and to
maintain its bargaining power for
their future. The Vancouver
Newspaper Workers' Union
(UNWU) is a collective
bargaining body representing
newspaper workers in the
province. The UNWU is a
class analysis of the labor
movement and the capitalist
system, and its members are
fighting for a better future.

Vancouver newspaper workers have
been fighting for rights and
benefits for decades. They have
struggled against management and
their union-busting tactics, and
have fought for their jobs.

The UNWU is a powerful
force in the labor movement,
and its members are fighting
for a better world.

The Vancouver Express was a
bilingual newspaper, which
published in both English and
French. It was a platform for
radical analysis and discussion,
and a source of hope for the
working class.
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source of hope for the
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The Express was a
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in the struggle for a better world.
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The Kremlin's Lieutenant in Africa

Fidel greets Leonel Brezhnev at Havana airport.

CUBA has the revolution degenerated to such a point that it has often been asked whether it is a Stalinist regime or a genuine popular revolution. Some have argued that the Cuban Revolution was merely a Stalinist takeover. Others believe that the Cuban Revolution was a genuine popular revolution, but that it has since degenerated into Stalinism. Still others argue that Cuba is a genuine popular revolution that has successfully resisted efforts by the United States and other imperialist powers to undermine it.

In this article, I will examine the Cuban Revolution and the question of whether it is a genuine popular revolution or a Stalinist regime.

The Cuban Revolution was a popular revolution that began in 1959 and led to the overthrow of Fulgencio Batista's regime. It was led by Fidel Castro and his followers, who established a communist government in Cuba. The revolution was marked by a number of significant events, including the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961, the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, and the development of a strong economy based on state ownership of industry.

The Cuban Revolution was not without its problems. Despite its successes, the government of Fidel Castro has been criticized for its human rights abuses, censorship, and lack of political freedom.

In this article, I will explore the events leading up to the Cuban Revolution, the challenges faced by the government of Fidel Castro, and the impact of the revolution on Cuba and the world.
Above: Ethiopian dictator Mengistu hosting Fidel on recent visit to Addis Ababa. Below: Cuban troops in Ethiopia.

Castro with Pinochet during the Allende regime.

Carl. Fidel Castro and the Fourth International," reprinted in Dynamics of the Left (Cuba) (November 1973) was to mildly recast Castro for "repudiating" Stalinist slanders, express the hope that his attack on Trotskyism would only be "an episodic step backward," and spend most of the article taking the P  It appears to contain fragments of sentences and words that do not form coherent paragraphs or thoughts. It is likely that the text is corrupted or damaged in some way, making it impossible to provide a meaningful natural text representation.
Stamberg Campaign...

(continued from page 12)

against the same Democratic incumbents, on the "independent" line with the active support of the CP and "communty control" advocates of Spanish-speaking Chicago. When he received 4.6 percent, it was noted as one of the best showings for any radical candidate anywhere in the U.S. that year.

Stamberg's impressive showing was not merely part of a general protest vote. In fact, there was less overlap among the votes cast for the left parties than one might have expected. Thus in many election districts Stamberg did well where the SWP CP did not. In one Chicago district, for instance, the Spartacist Party got 20 votes, the CP's and the SWP 2. Yet we campaigned hard in the districts and cooperated and did not get many votes, whereas the CP rolled up most of its vote for the entire assembly district in these few blocks.

We ran a intensive campaign. Unlike the reformists whose primary purpose is to achieve credentials as a respectable "socialist alternative" electoral party, we run to make communist propagandize. So we ran for an office that did not require us to spend too much time collecting petition signatures. Instead, we devised the soap-box street corner, handed out thousands of pages of literature, pasted up posters on lamp posts and subway stations, gave interviews to local newspapers. From the first public act of the campaign—supporting the striking pressmen on their picket lines—we wanted the residents of the 64th Assembly District to know that here was a revolutionary socialist campaign going on.

We wanted to make people sit up and take notice. We wanted to show them that the program of social revolution bears no resemblance to rotten liberal or to the reformism of the second-hand Democrats of the CP and SWP. In liberal Greenwich Village, we ran against all that liberal chic stood for. Sometimes it must have seemed to them impossible to choose, impossible to get.

"Our program puts forward little-unrealized solutions to the city's difficulties, some of which have a distinct appeal: expropriation of the banks, Cen Edson, and New York Telephone (where Stamberg worked); restoration of free admission to the city university system; and the abolition of the Emergency Financial Control Board.

Of course, he singled out for criticism Stamberg's opposition to "petty bourgeois" ecologic faddism.

At the election night celebration, Stamberg noted it was the enormous effort of the New York Spartacist League that "put us on the map in this city." The election campaign was "not so much more than we usually do, but more visible." The Truth Doesn't Hurt

The campaign confirmed much of what we knew was true about political life in America, reminded us of some things we hadn't thought much about for a while, and taught us a few things.

Our anti-electoral bias never pushed us into some mistakes early on. As Stamberg said after the election: "For us it seemed right for everyone to go out and vote for the central committee of his choice." In the process we almost forgot to publicize our candidate. Finally we realized we had to strike a balance between our program and the candidate who could win.

It is a commonplace in American bourgeois election campaigns that politicians lie. In fact, in common parlance the words "campaign promises" are understood to mean "cynical speech." And the reformists say the same thing; they just lie about different things. On the other hand, the government can be "pressured" into fighting for working people, that whatever is popular is right.

Just how powerful the truth can be was demonstrated in a central campaign debate when the Spartacist's legend confronted the CP and SWP (see "Race War or Class War," WN No. 218, November). No, the SWP lied to cover for the black Democratic pork-barriers in Crown Heights, Brooklyn. We told the truth about what happened—that a protest which should have been mounted against killer-cop brutality was marched instead on a synagogue.

During the campaign, we were struck by the depth of electoralist illusions among the American public. (In fact, many people take voting so seriously that they gave us a candidate a hearing that we might not otherwise get.) It is a testament to American backwardness that so many workers are deceived by the electoral process, an exercise in illusion-mongering controlled by the ruling class (and junked when capitalist expediency requires). And we were disgusted by the extent to which the reformists add to these deadly illusions.

With strikingly similar programs and aims, the CP and SWP ran quite similar campaigns. During one television roundtable of minor candidates, the CP's Jarvis Tyner and the SWP's Diane Feeley "what the differences are between the SWP and the CP." There were no takers. Finally Tyner told the moderator that if he listened "carefully" he could detect a difference between the parties' programs, adding quickly that of course they shared "the same general approach." Evidently the SWP isn't too embarrassed by its own opportunism and a party it still formally characterizes as revolutionary. Diane Feeley said the SWP liked "some [of Trotsky's ideas]."

Even Advocate Stamberg did not win the election. But the Spartacist election campaign was a bold step victory for those who believe in the revolutionary fight for his program of international proletarian revolution.
Castro...

(continued from page 7)

Why is the SWP so eager to rush to the support of Cuba’s African ventures? Most likely for a variety of reasons. One is indicated by Hansen’s curious remark: “A new aspect of this involvement is its legality… In responding to the appeal [of the MPLA], the Cubans acted in accordance with international law.” Contrary to Hansen’s remark quoted earlier, there was a significant aspect of this intervention that was firmly against Cuba as a stabilizing influence in Africa. Unwilling to see American forebodings, “a blood-stained civil war in Angola and repressing the unpredictable demagoguery of Mengistu in Ethiopia. Thus U.S. ambassador to the United Nations Andrew Young noted on a television interview that “there’s a sense in which the Cubans bring a certain stability and order to Angola” (New York Times, 3 February 1977). Hansen is remembering the days when the SWP made a political bloc with the defeatist wing of the Democratic Party over Vietnam.

Another reason is certainly to cover up its own infamous neutrality during the heat of the 1975-76 South African invasion. At that time the SWP refused to take sides between the Soviet/Cuban-backed MPLA and the CIA-financed FNLA or South African-backed UNITA. In a National Committee report in the 23 January 1976 Militant (the South African invasion was launched in late October 1975), SWP spokesman Tony Thompkins stated: “If the imperialist intervention increases, as seems quite likely, we may decide to favor the victory of one or another of the groups on tactical grounds, but of course without giving a ‘political’ support.”

In point of fact, the SWP never got around to adjusting its line while the fighting was going on, causing it some notoriety within the United Secretariat.

Hansen’s former ally, American black nationalist Eldridge Cleaver, has called the SWP’s line “a factional club to beat the SWP. The Militant, for example, has published a lengthy interview with its comrade supreme in which he described how Cuba independently decided to aid the Angolan MPLA against the South African/CIA assault. Hansen also notes that Cuba “in the crisis of the 1975-76 South African invasion, left the meeting of the SWP with the SWP and now quickly decided to take sides between the Cuban/South African bloc and the NATO/CIA bloc.”

In fact, the SWP never got around to adjusting its line while the fighting was going on, causing it some notoriety within the United Secretariat.

Hansen is certainly aware that the SWP is not the only group that has been critical of Cuban foreign policy in Africa. The same issue of New International (21 September 1976) which publishes a translation of Hansen’s introduction also contains a counterarticle by Mandelite Afrika expert “Claude” Gabriel on “The Role of Cuba in Africa.” After excoriating Cuba for the brutal repression of leftists by its allies in Angola and Ethiopia—something Hansen mentions only by the—he notes: “It would be wrong to mechanical–ly conclude from the existence of conflict between Cuba and imperialist powers that Cuba is incapable of leading the imperialist struggle which was its only hope of victory in the long run; it would have to be replaced through a proletariat–an political revolution. As Castro has become increasingly obviously enmeshed in the Kremlin’s global maneuvers, abandoning its guerrilla supporter–ly, leading “anti-imperialist” rulers and the like, it is our Marxism analysis that is confirmed over and over. And the fact that Castro’s policies are simply a part of a broader “pro-labor” imperialist–ally, consistently liquidating Castro’s policy.

And it doesn’t explain Cuban policy in Africa or anywhere else.
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Socialist Stumphur, runs not to win, but to offer choice

[Daily News] 17 NOVEMBER 1978
The Iranian masses have taken to the streets in opposition to the terror of the blood-drenched Pahlavi monarchy. The shah’s response has been to increase the repressive pressures. But unfortunately for the shah, the masses are not a pliable population, nor was the shah’s white terror, or even bourgeois-aided “democratic” movement, the current opposition to an amorphous movement led by the religious leaders. The religious leaders’ control over mass demonstrations has forced “leftists” to split into two or more political formations. For Stalinists, who are not yet bold enough to jump off anyone from Chiang Kai-shek to Nasser to even Idi Amin, portraying the several leaders of the opposition as ex-Atollah Khomeini, as a “progressive” is second nature. But swallowing this line has apparently posed some problems for the ex-Enraged Press of the American Socialist Workers Party (SWP).

The SWP has longed-based about the most consistent targets of the Islamic movement on the American left. They also publish the works of Leon Trotsky. So when the SWP was faced with a mass-based opposition to the shah which at times stoned women for not wearing the symbol of medieval oppression, it was these same Trotskyite intellectuals who had gone through some gerations to claim that black is white, that the “mass movement” is really “a step forward.” But they have made the effort, nonetheless, for the fundamentalists to achieve their ends. The SWP’s one criterion for support: “mass actions in the streets.”

The obsession with an answer of a Rosenstock-based Trotskyist organization (not to mention any one claiming to be “socialist,” “democratic,” or even socialist) is the driving force for a Muslim theocracy. They demand a letter from an ex-member. Marx Karson, a long response by SWP Per David Franklin in the Militant of 3 November. The writer of the letter observed that “the masses’ leaders” opposition to the shah was based on a hatred of alcohol, movies, women’s rights and on a puritanish, Western-oriented version of modernity. In this there was an important matter of notation. The letter further noted that “I saw nothing in your coverage of the demonstrations to counter the impression, especially on the crucial point of emancipation of women, which the party seemed to oppose.”

Frankel’s response was filled with the predictably, opportunistic talk of mass struggles, irreversibly set in motion, of ever unfolding revolutionary “dynamics” and “processes,” and so on. He tried to claim that the religious leaders’ moves to determine the political thrust of the anti-shah movement, don’t control this movement, are irrelevant to the future of the struggle and in any case were “progressive” in the early stages of the struggle. Anyhow, says Frankel, it’s all been blown up by the bourgeois press anyway! Garson, however, had already made note of the SWP’s cácical fallacy in its description of the Militant’s journalism: “So much on the evening of the lighting in Iran, and so little on the character of it” (emphasis in original).

The Ostrich Peers About

In order to portray the mullah-led movement as small and limited, the SWP suppresses the Muslim preachers’ unashamedly reactionary slogans. One week ago, using as an example the followers of exalted Atollah Khomeini shouted for “Death or the veil” in the streets of Tabriz, that the religious center of Qom is a city completely bereft of movies, non-religious literature, bars or women without the traditional chador (veil) or cloak that Khomeini is a staunch anti-colonialist who adamantly refuses any collaboration with the left, that the protesters’ choice of targets is motivated by the “anti-imperialism” of the Koran: “sacrifice,” “income,” “imposed” movies, etc.

Amazingly, Frankel’s article does not mention Khomeini’s game only given Khomeini’s role as the head of the religious opposition, and his portrait which adorns virtually every demonstration: this archaic posture is a symbol. So in a subsequent Militant 17 November, we find the following brazen statement among its usual tirades on the question of women’s rights. Only a year ago the SWP’s co-thinkers in the Iranian Sattar League published a central programmatic document to a long exposition on the women’s movement in Iran. In a country still under the sway of medieval obsessions they threw in every party, in the National Organization for Women’s programs down to 24-hour day care. Wrote the Sattar League: “Religious superstition and all the backward, hierarchical sexual relationships will be challenged by the growth of the movement” (adopted in SWP’s second and Fundamental Freedom in Iran (CAW). a committee which banned Iranian killed opposition, and so on, to counter that the SWP is confronted with a “women’s movement” which serves as the pretext for “popularizing” the Iranian masses because his sale point is matched to it. But unfortunately for this journalistic fact, the same Kholl1cin” n:lil1c’ mobilization of the bourgeoisie has been blown over by the bourgeois press: that the masses have taken to the streets of Tabriz: that the shah has been shut down as a symbol of medieval oppression, the鹿 has been blown to deal with the bourgeois press: that the masses have taken to the streets of Tabriz: that the shah has been shut down as a symbol of medieval oppression, the...
Iran...

occupied newspaper offices and radio
and television facilities.

It is deplorable to make the policy of
the mailed fist more credible by an
nouncing yet another purge of his
underlings. A number of government
and business figures including former
prime minister Amir Abbas Hoveida
were arrested last week. Hoveida, the
shah even rounded up more than a
dozen officials of the dreaded SAVAK,
his sadistic secret police, and former
SAVAK head Nematomollah Narsi for
"anti-government activities.

While hoping that sheet military
force on the streets of Iran would
contain the protests, the shah began
casting about for partners in a coalition
government. The bourgeois liberals of
the National Front were the natural
choice. Particularly since the current
crisis would allow them increased
leverage in wheeling and dealing with
the shah. The establishment of a
coalition government featuring a tame
house opposition would permit an
unbridled military crackdown on
leftists and strikers.

The National Front, however, refused
that honor over the crowds in the
cracks, the means by which to
pressure the shah, is in the hands of
Khomeini. So these bourgeois liberals
have instead absolved themselves before
this "messager of Muhammad." Na-
tional Front leader Karim Sanjabi told
Le Monde (1 November) that his
"democratic, national and socialist
government" is really the same as
Khomeini's "Islamic government."

Unlike the National Front, Khomeini
adamantly refuses all negotiation with
the shah. National Front shrank
and forth between visits to Khomeini,
eached in France, and discussions with
the shah's emissaries. In the end he yelled
at the ayatollah's press and an-
ounced, "We will continue the
trouble" and refused to enter a coalition with
the shah. On November 11 he repudiated
the decision of this decree when he
and his aides were arrested in Tehran.

Oil Strike Shock Waves

Up until now the Pahlavi dictatorship has
been able to repel all oil worker
protests led by Khomeini and the other
Muslim fundamentalist leaders, despite
their increased size and the pressure of
the current oil workers' strike threatens
to cripple the Iranian economy and eat
away at the shah's treasury.

Because of its strategic position at
the lifeline of Iran's economy, the oil strike is
the most important of the many strike
waves whose demands have esca-
lated from simple wage claims to
assaults on the regime's barbaric tools of
oppression. The month-old strike of
government employees is still in full
force. Employees at the Ministry of
Finance parade through its halls chanting
"Death to the Shah!" Some half
a million workers continue their two-
month-long strike demanding an end
to martial law, freedom for the prisoners
in the shah's dungeons, their own inde-
pendent teachers union and the end of
state censorship and SAVAK interfer-
e in the schools.

On October 28 the telecommunica-
tion workers struck demanding a union,
the release of political prisoners and
the investigation of the corruption and
secret deals with American firms made
by the industry. The employees of Iran
Railroad similar political demands in
their November 1 strike. Late October
of the extent of his authority is the
printing of paper money bearing his
portrait rather than the shah's. He is the
idol of the petty shopkeepers of the
bazaar. One New York Times account
(November) quoted a hardware store
owner as saying, "Khomeini said we
won't work—we don't work. If he says
we go back, we go back."

On the streets of Iran's cities, thou-
sands of Muslim students are shocked
trucks, expressing the movement's
program of Islamic fundamentalism
by attacking liquor stores, movie theaters
and dungeons. These were again the
targets (including a Pepsi Cola plant)
in the anti-shah movement. In the last few
months reports indicate that with
the release of a number of leftist
prisoners and the reopening of the universities
the Iranian left has become a more vocal and
organized presence. A D.T. has its
parallels in the military-based regimes
of Pakistan or Libya and in the region's
authoritarian nationalism and its vicious oppession of women.

Parliamentary democracies is hardly
the recipe for a disastrous defeat
and reaction. One observer aptly summar-
ized the real meaning of Khomeini's "Islamic
socialism" as "a mere adventure of the
Pakistani type, which under the cover of a religious
facade, will endeavour to satisfy the
bureaucrats by conducting a double fight
against corruption and for the defense of
Islamic values."

Khomeini and his followers have
opened a new chapter in the struggle for
an Iranian workers and peasants' movement's
struggle for an Islamic and socialist
regime, placing it in place of the
proletariat. There are limits to its
strength, but "anti-imperialist" is
nothing more than an observation that is
shaking up Western culture and modernization.

Khomeini and the mullahs have
support from the unemployed, the
millions of Pakistan or Libya and in the
region's authoritarian nationalism and its vicious oppession of women.

An Iranian Trotskyist party must join
the struggle for bourgeois democratic
demands. But this is impossible
from an irrevocable opposition to the
current "reactionary" drive. The struggle
for a secular, coherent, consistent, organized, armed, and united,
women's rights, smashing SAVAK and
the monarch; and the right of self-
determination for Iran's oppressed nationalities are
impossible without the independent
mobilization of the working class.

The Iranian Trotskyist vanguard party
can help lead the struggle against all those who seek to tie
the working class to an "anti-imperialist unitary
front"—to the full extent of the
Khomeini's "national wealth" theory
ever since the 1940s. The Marxist-Leninist
class struggle against all those who seek to tie
the working class to an "anti-imperialist unitary
front"—to the full extent of the
Khomeini's "national wealth" theory
ever since the 1940s. The Marxist-Leninist
class struggle against all those who seek to tie
the working class to an "anti-imperialist unitary
front"—to the full extent of the
Khomeini's "national wealth" theory
ever since the 1940s. The Marxist-Leninist
Workers' Vanguard
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3.2 Percent Vote Spartacist in NYC Election

The Stamberg Campaign: A Bolshevik Success

NEW YORK CITY, November 14—When the Spartacist League undertook to run a bolshevik election campaign in New York in 1978, we were not expecting to get a lot of votes. The New Left liberal hegemony of the 1960’s is long gone, even the Great Israeli Crisis is almost over. So we took as the theme of our campaign nothing more “tropical” than socialist revolution “the most elementary of this city’s problems leads inexorably to one conclusion; it will take a socialist revolution to save ” New York City.

Expecting reformists “tax the rich” gimmicks, we squarely addressed the working people’s mind and posed the perspective of a struggle led by the labor movement. Hugging in the face of the present liberal crusades (like “ecological” opposition to a West Side expressway), we put forward solutions that make sense. Yet the revolution as our issue and ran with it for two months—a visible, continuous, ag­gressive socialist campaign. Though we always said the future will be decided not at the polls but on the battle lines of the class struggle, nevertheless we were frankly gratified to find we made a lot of sense to a lot of the voters of the 64th Assembly District.

On election night, Spartacist Party “poll watchers” brought the news from 94 of the 96 election districts in the 64th Assembly District to an election night celebration of campaign supporters. The results, which had been part of the day meeting voters on their way to the polls with “palm cards” urging them to vote “For a Socialist Fight to Save New York,” cheered the news that Stamberg had received 871 votes, more than 3.2 percent (see Spartacist Party Campaign Committee press release, reprinted in this issue). Having aimed our campaign not only against the capitalists and their Demo­cratic Party but also against the reformism of the Communist Party (CP) and Socialist Workers Party (SWP)—denouncing their electoralism, their appeal to shift the “priorities” of capitalism—we were pleased to have outpolled the “two parties” of reform­ism, whose gubernatorial candidates took an unsurprising 1.6 percent each in the 64th Assembly District.

In general, left candidates usually poll about one and a half percent or less. In this somewhat more radical district, which includes parts of Greenwich Village and Chelsea, the figures are often somewhat higher. In 1976 a Daily World staff writer, Amadeo Richard­son, ran for the same office as Stamberg continued on page 8

The Stamberg campaign revived the soap-box, street corner rally.

NEW YORK CITY, November 10—The Spartacist Party announces that its candidate for NY State Assembly in the Chelsea, MARJORIE STAM­BERG, received 871 votes in Tues­day’s election (with returns in from 94 of the 96 Election Districts), amounting to over 3.2 percent of the total vote cast for Assembly in the district. In several Election Districts on the Inner East Side and in the West Village-Stamberg tallied as much as 10 percent of the vote. This was a substantial showing for the revolutionary socialist candidate who ran against incumbent liberal Democrat William Passannante.

Stamberg’s vote was actually higher than that of the leftist Assembly candidates in NYC where they ran as a third party instead of simply endorsing the Democrats, and exceeded the totals of ten Republican candidates as well. Yet the New York Times and other media which publish the vote totals of even the minor capitalist parties (including “Right-to-Life” candidates) uniformly fail to report the election results of the parties of the radical left. In the 64th A.D. the gubernatorial candidates of the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party received 457 and 459 votes respectively, or 1.6 percent of total votes cast for governor in the district.

The Stamberg campaign received widespread press coverage in the Village Voice, Newswalk, SoHo Weekly News, Black American, Villager, Gay Communities News, Columbia Street Journal and Washington Square News. Attention focused on the fact that Stamberg’s campaign FOR A SOCIALIST FIGHT TO SAVE NEW YORK posed revolutionary solutions as the only answer to the city’s problems. Spartacist Party campaign literature called upon the “powerful NYC labor movement” to lead a united struggle on behalf of all the oppressed. Reckon with the Democrats, dump the union bureaucrats who help the banks loot the city, and build a mass workers party which would fight for a workers government.” Village Voice columnist Joe Conason wrote that he was disappointed because Passannante had refused to debate Stamberg; he would have liked “to watch a liberal Democrat answer the accusations of a tough Trotskyist.”

The Spartacist Party campaign laid particular stress on the need for a working-class defense of democratic rights. Demonstrating for the passage of Intro 384, the NYC gay rights bill, Stamberg warned that the Democratic Party was leading an assault against democratic rights for homosexuals, as well as against women, blacks and other minorities. Two days after the election, the Democratic-dominated City Council voted down Intro 384. Against the background of the rising cycle of communal violence in Crown Heights, Stamberg called for an end to vigilante terror on both sides, blaming the pork-barrel Democratic politicians for sidetracking the federal outrage of blacks against killer cops into ethnic hatreds.

The Spartacist Party attracted attention in the district with its campaign against the parties of big business by revising the old socialist tradition of street corner “soap box” rallies. This was not just one more “protest candidate.” Stamberg reject­ed “reformist schemes of penny-ante municipal reform, tax the rich gimmicks and community control.” She also spoke out against popular anti-Westway sentiment, pointing out that Manhattan needs adequate highway transportation and improved mass transit. Following the election, Stamberg explained the success of the Trotskyist campaign: “We offered the plain truth. If we rolled up twice the percentage of both our reformist political opponents, it may well be because a growing number of Americans are prepared to hear the revolutionary truth and are tired of the second-hand Demo­crats on the left.”