December 4—After a quarter century of rule by torture and bloody repression, Iran's shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi may now be facing the final showdown with a Muslim-led movement determined to overthrow him. The military government headed by General Gholam Reza Azhari announced that all religious processions and even mosque services held without permission would be outlawed during the Islamic month of mourning, Moharram, which began on December 2.

This measure has been seized on by Ayatollah Khomeini, the exiled patriarch of Iran's Shi'ite Muslims, as the signal for a campaign of mass demonstrations in defiance of martial law. Khomeini appealed to his followers in the name of a jihad against the shah.

For Workers Revolution to Overthrow the Shah!

Demonstrators in Teheran burn portraits of the shah and his family.

The urgent task confronting Iranian revolutionaries today is the reforging of an independent proletarian axis around which to rally the working masses against both the shah's dictatorship and the reactionary Islamic clergy, who currently dominate the opposition. In the 1945-46 rebellion centered among the Turkish-speaking Azerbaijani workers and again in the nation-wide struggles of 1951-53 which impelled the nationalization of the oil industry by the bourgeois nationalist Mohammad Mossadeq, the working class has been the vanguard. But the continuity of Iranian proletarian struggle was broken, not only by the bloody repression at the hands of the U.S.-sponsored dictator but by the betrayals of Iranian Stalinists.

The pro-Moscow Tudeh (Masses) party, the hegemonic leadership of the first two waves of workers' struggles since the war, not only misled its followers into political dependence on the "progressive" nationalist Mossadeq, but was badly discredited by the counterrevolutionary, pro-shah stance adopted by its Kremlin mentors. The Marxist groupings which subsequently attracted the allegiance of Iranian leftist students have similarly been compromised by Peking's "peaceful coexistence" with, and even outright political support for, the tyrant of the Peacock throne.

Today the militant workers who have launched massive economic and political strikes in Iran are without a broad-based, independent proletarian leadership. Into this vacuum have stepped Khomeini and the Muslim mullahs. The Koran fundamentalists have their strongest hold over the petty-bourgeois bazaar merchants and the backward and oppressed peasants. But they also maintain considerable influence over the oppressed peasants. But they also maintain considerable influence over large sections of the working class in the region, a working class which has seen considerable periods in the years following World War II period taken the lead in explosive social struggles.
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British Spartacist Denounces Anti Nazi League Scabs

Mobilize British Labor to Fight the National Front


Peter Markow

This fall a rather unique message resounded through lower Manhattan carried over speakers and on the radio. That message: For a Socialist Fight To Save New York.

The Spartan party candidate for assembly, Marjorie Stamberg, campaigned hard to rally the people of NYC to nothing more than revolutionary solutions to the agonizing problems which face this city. We gave it to people straight off the bat that the National Front, the Mao Tses and the communists were nothing but a fabrication of the bourgeoisie faced with the prospect of its own overthrow.

comrade Flanagan, a former member of the Communist Party and a leading member of the British Labour movement against it.

comrade Flanagan: "I outlined to the National Front (NF) since 1974."

The question most obviously posed by these developments is — why Britain and why now? Recalling Trotsky's capsule analysis of fascism as the last resort of a desperate bourgeoisie faced with the prospect of its own overthrow, Flanagan, a former member of the Communist Party and a leading member of the British Labour movement against it.

Moreover, the bourgeoisie is faced with a strong, undefeated working class which in the past has fought against and undercut the bourgeoisie's the situation looks bleak.

The willingness of the British bourgeoisie to opt for a fascist solution is shown by events of the past. During the crisis-wracked 1930s, when the German bourgeoisie turned to Hitler's brownshirts, there arose in Britain a fascist movement — Sir Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists (BUF) — which

Bolshevik Success in NYC Elections

This fall a rather unique message resounded through lower Manhattan carried over speakers and on the radio. That message: For a Socialist Fight To Save New York.

The Spartan party candidate for assembly, Marjorie Stamberg, campaigned hard to rally the people of NYC to nothing more than revolutionary solutions to the agonizing problems which face this city. We gave it to people straight off the bat that the National Front, the Mao Tses and the communists were nothing but a fabrication of the bourgeoisie faced with the prospect of its own overthrow.

The election results were particularly gratifying as they showed that where the Spartacist Party campaign captured the imagination of many voters, the swollen-over liberal political parties, led by the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and Communist Party (CP) received significant less support. Stamberg received a higher percentage of the vote than any leftist candidate running in NYC. The SWP and CP gubernatorial candidates received a higher percentage of the vote in the 64th Assembly District than in any other district in Manhattan, which nevertheless amounted to only 1.6 percent respectively or only half of Stamberg's total.

It is interesting that the SWP which masquerades as the best fighters for democratic rights for homosexuals, while capitalizing to dangerous illusory of "gay power," was trounced by Stamberg in those parts of the district with the highest concentration of homosexuals. The Spartacist campaign on the other hand stressed the importance of the labor movement taking up the fight for democratic rights for all oppressed sectors of the population.

As a demonstration of protest, the defeat of Intro 384 (a gay rights bill) by the NYC Council shortly after the campaign. Stamberg was continually approached by well-wishers asking how she had done in the election.

The election results must prove a particularly bitter pill for the electoral elitists of the SWP to swallow. Having just written a sterile polemic denouncing the Spartan Party, Spartacus Youth League as "an American sect head[ed] for outer space," the SWP saw its candidate fall short of the swing that the Left has made in the 64th Assembly District as somehow similarly worthy of intergalactic voyage.

While votes in an election cannot be equated with leading the working masses in concrete struggles against the bourgeoisie, we must make every effort to our capacity to address the real burning social issues of our society without tailoring our program for the bourgeoisie. The Daily Mail (a leading capitalist daily), for example, had as its headline in the issue of 15 January 1934, "Hurrah For the Criminal Front!"

Clad in blackshirts, Mosley's bands held a series of meetings throughout England during the 1933-36 period, aimed at terrorizing immigrant groups and crushing the unions. ("We've got to get rid of the Yids" was one of their chants, a slogan emulated by the National Front of today.) In June of 1934 they held a 15,000 strong indoor rally at the Olympia building in London, beating up would-be hecklers in the audience and demonstrating openly their vicious determination to silence all those who challenge their rule.

As the real character of Mosley's movement became clear, the working class began to fight back. In June 1936, a BUF meeting in the coal mining town of Tonyandy in South Wales was broken up and the fascists were driven out of the area. But it wasn't until a couple of months later that the decisive blow was struck against Mosley, in what became known as "The Battle of Cable Street" — named after the site in London's East End where the BUF was based. The events of the day were described by comrade Flanagan:

"So the culmination came on the 4th of October 1936. Mosley had organized for that day a demonstration to march into the East End of London right through a heavily Jewish area. This was a deliberate provocation in much the same way as Hitler's fascists had marched through Altona, a working-class, Jewish area of Hamburg, five months earlier. The reaction of the Labour Party to what was going on in Britain at that time was that they weren't going to do anything about it. The Communist Party of Great Britain, which today is the leading champions of the fight against the fascist movement, did not go there. They said there is a rally to take place in Tottenham Square the same day and people should go and march there.

"As it was the Communist Party eventually marched. Under pressure continued on page 11
The Divestment Conference That Wasn’t
Reformists Sell Anti-Apartheid Struggle Shortages

in the world today: The Main Enemy is at Home!
South African Nationalists

The conference organizers hoped to lay their credentials as champions of anti-white-supremacist unity by including in the agenda presentations by representatives of various “liberation movements.” Even this backfired as rival organizations engaged in a polemical free-for-all. In fact, the head-on clash between the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) during the afternoon workshop sessions prefigured the upcoming conference fight. The ANC charged that the PAC’s rabid “African socialism” nationalism was synonymous with race hate in which “the only good white man is a dead man.” The PAC speaker explained with the victory of the “African majority,” “everybody there will have to culturally toe the line” and the South African Indian population could stay “as long as their loyalty is to Africa only.” In other words—communist political opponents, national minorities and workers strikes “disloyal to Africa” would be suppressed by a PAC regime.

The ANC speaker pointed to the PAC’s historic ties to the Angolan FNLA and UNITA and attributed the ANC/PAC split to the ANC’s willingness to ally with South African “Coloureds” (mestizos), Indians and “progressive” whites. This brought forth an infuriated response from PAC representatives who denied they had a blanket opposition to the white and Asian population in South Africa and claimed that both the PAC and the Organization of African Unity had reversed their support to the FNLA and UNITA “on the basis of new facts.”

Countering the ANC salvo, the PAC hinted at the dangers of “Soviet domination” in the ANC’s fraternal relationship with the South African Communist Party. This of course perked up the Maoris in the audience who were cagily awaiting the opportunity for an “anti-Soviet socialist imperalist” offensive. But the ANC was out to “out-respectable” the PAC. While accepting aid from the “socialist countries,” the ANC assured the audience that the bulk of its money came from Scandinavia.

(Drake Koka, the leader of the PAC)

in South Africa is divestment that it goes down for power in southern Africa. The of apartheid in their operation. sive. But the ANC was out to

The tactic of divestment to fight this vicious system is at bottom little more than a slim hope for some foreign liberal well-wishers and is basically a substitute for those tactics based upon the real struggle of the black-centered, working-class struggle for power in southern Africa. The Spartacus Youth League, while hardly opposed to “divestment” as such recognizes its empty quality which in the best case merely gives less scrupu-

Black Allied Workers Union and no participant at the workshop got dragged into the mud-slinging. An anonymous letter entitled “Who’s Afraid of Koka?” appeared charging that Koka’s union front had failed to oppose apartheid for a several-year period until that Koka was somehow in cahoots with the Ford Foundation.

While the class character of a state headed by either the ANC or the PAC would be the same—both have as their goal a neo-colonialist regime by definition dependent on Western capital—the ANC aspires to the model of the MPLA in Angola while the PAC looks to Nyerere’s Tanzania. The fight was a clear indication of the impact of the internationalization of the Angolan civil war in 1973. When the formerly anti-Portuguese guerilla armies of the FNLA and UNITA became the pawns of U.S./China supported South African invasions against the Soviet/Cuba backed MPLA, mindless enthusiasm for “all Third World Struggles” became

Andersson (leader of the PAC) was the man. He is now considered a member of the ANC’s willing­

By contrast the South African “co­loureds” (mestizos) are not South Africa but Africa itself, such a withdrawal is a blow against apartheid repression. Not appeals to the racist

lous investors a better deal. Serious militants, while not flinching from auxiliary tactics including a limited divestment, must center the fight against apartheid on the social power of black labor. Key to this fight are the following tactics:

1. Labor action, including strikes, against the multi-nationals to force them to recognize black unions and eliminate all aspects in apartheid in their operation.

2. Hot-cargging of all military goods bound for South Africa.

3. A fight to free all victims of apartheid repression.
Fake Trotskyists Plead: Love the Murhans—Love the SWP!

There is something downright offensive about having to debate the question of the attitude of the workers movement toward religiosity and clericalism. The line has certainly changed. The religious obscurantism was drawn long ago—over 140 years ago Marx penned the capsule summary of religion as the "opium of the people." It is not as if the Marxist movement did not stand by the gains of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions, not least of which was the separation of church and state. So it is with a sense of outrage that we have to cross swords with an ostensibly Marxist organization, let alone one that claims the mantle of Trotskyism, over the attitude of revolutionists toward a reactionary drive for a theocratic state.

At issue in this case is the anti-shah revolt raging in Iran. With the shah's rule visibly tottering, the question of the final regime of the country becomes particularly pressing. The streets of Teheran and other centers of protest. At present, the overthrow of the shah, not the replacement of the religious leaders, is the issue. But then again Khomeini's name conveniently appears nowhere in the text of Frankel's article. For other authors, and the SWP, which likes to parade about as a god-sent "Trotskyist" eminence to feminism, the omission of any mention of the forcible encloakment of women protesters in the medieval chador (veil) is striking. In a country where women have never attained even the formal equality granted them under bourgeois democracy, to try and avoid this question is sheer treachery.

But for Frankel, having now written several apologies for the SWP on Iran, contrarily to his previous work, his line is that a fight against the shah's regime is the "forward looking"? approach to the problem. Frankel backs this up by using the example of the new assault on the very secular nationalism. The SWP's reaction to the death of the shah is as if the SWP's members were too desirous of having something to fight for, a role explicitly disdained by the Spartacist League.

But Frankel, having now written several apologies for the SWP on Iran, contrarily to his previous work, his line is that a fight against the shah's regime is the "forward looking" approach to the problem. Frankel backs this up by using the example of the new assault on the very secular nationalism. The SWP's reaction to the death of the shah is as if the SWP's members were too desirous of having something to fight for, a role explicitly disdained by the Spartacist League.

Particularly despicable is Frankel's clumsy "editing" of a November 17 Workers Vanguard article to "prove" that the SL and SYL do not support democratic demands. Frankel quotes the SWP'spresidential, a god-sent emissary to Islamic Students of Tabriz on the Uprising: "Several cales and sandwich shops were also named among the damaged shops. All of such cafes and shops sold alcoholic beverages. The fact that alcohol is not allowed in Iran and that the Quran has banned its consumption justifies the above actions." (Review of Islamic Political Economy and History, June 1978). In leaguing horror over our defense of

The question of the attitude of the workers movement toward religiosity and clericalism. The line has certainly changed. The religious obscurantism was drawn long ago—over 140 years ago Marx penned the capsule summary of religion as the "opium of the people." It is not as if the Marxist movement did not stand by the gains of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions, not least of which was the separation of church and state. So it is with a sense of outrage that we have to cross swords with an ostensibly Marxist organization, let alone one that claims the mantle of Trotskyism, over the attitude of revolutionists toward a reactionary drive for a theocratic state.

At issue in this case is the anti-shah revolt raging in Iran. With the shah's rule visibly tottering, the question of the final regime of the country becomes particularly pressing. The streets of Teheran and other centers of protest. At present, the overthrow of the shah, not the replacement of the religious leaders, is the issue. But then again Khomeini's name conveniently appears nowhere in the text of Frankel's article. For other authors, and the SWP, which likes to parade about as a god-sent "Trotskyist" eminence to feminism, the omission of any mention of the forcible encloakment of women protesters in the medieval chador (veil) is striking. In a country where women have never attained even the formal equality granted them under bourgeois democracy, to try and avoid this question is sheer treachery.

But for Frankel, having now written several apologies for the SWP on Iran, contrarily to his previous work, his line is that a fight against the shah's regime is the "forward looking" approach to the problem. Frankel backs this up by using the example of the new assault on the very secular nationalism. The SWP's reaction to the death of the shah is as if the SWP's members were too desirous of having something to fight for, a role explicitly disdained by the Spartacist League. In leaguing horror over our defense of
clericalism symbolizing the preservation of archaic activity and purchase the literature they need. The answer to the "matter of Saudi oil princes' is the result of the slaughter of half a million leftists. 

exception in model: the holy city of Qom, where the mullahs whipped up another petty-bourgeois followers see as a parallel of Stalinist school of falsification. The SWP's, former attorney general Ramsey Clark, has emerged in the White House visit? Nowhere was CAIFI, backed to the hilt by the Islamic imperialist backers has been clear. The movement was then too revoltingly barter, the 7th century!

"Down with the Shah" Political arguments are the rare exception in SWP polemics. Frankel appears quite at home concocting positions to attribute to us. His charge that our opposition to the mullahs "has echoed the line of the capitalist media" could have come straight from the Stalinist school of falsification. The Spartacist tendency's opposition to the bloody Pahlavi dynasty and its American capitalist backers has been clear and consistent-unlike the SWP's, ever responsive as it is to the pressure of liberal-bourgeois public opinion. (Similarly, the article asserts out of the blue that, "the Cuban revolution is another movement that the Spartacists decided not to support."

Worse yet is the SWP's revoltingly complacent refusal to consider the parallels of Pakistan, where clerical reaction led a mass "movement" which forced the establishment of an Islamic military dictatorship, or of Indonesia, where the mullahs whipped up another "mass movement" which added in the slaughter of half a million leftists.

Iranian demonstrators is that of the mullahs. Their drive for a theocracy, is not seen, the political body that are calling the shots. They called for an end to the tsarist regime by a Russian revolution-in which a demonstration of the proletariat; the lowly priest himself be carried by the waves.

"Trotsky destroyed the analogy: Gapon was "in a perplexing manner placed by history at the head of the working masses for several days." His influence quickly waned, proving to be no obstacle to the independent organization of the proletariat; the lowly priest was an incidental figure.

There is nothing incidental about Khomeini's role. His position in the Russian Orthodox patriarchy is equivalent to the Russian Orthodox hierarchy is equivalent to the Catholic papacy. Far from being an isolated individual swept up in the floodtide of events, he is directing the flood of his authority as prelate of the Russian church by the toiling masses can wait-

Trotsky, 1905 In Iran the question is not one of the mass identification with an historically transient figure, but—as we have repeatedly stressed—one in which the workers have set the tenor and determined the political character of the protests. It is the clergy as an organized clerical body that are calling the shots. We will be interested to see if the SWP's Iranian allies carry out the Militant's injunction to "win the leadership of such a movement by participating in it and helping to advance the struggle for its demands..."

"In order to fight for these demands the Bolsheviks called for the extension of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party. This was a front on the tsarist regime by a Russian revolution-in which a demonstration of the proletariat; the lowly priest himself be carried by the waves."

Trotsky, 1905

Iranian Commune before they were slaughtered? SWP and Menshevism

The Frankel article does have a discernable political message. Of course, if a pro-capitalist government—religious or not—is formed in the future, revolutionaries will oppose it. But the real struggle in Iran is against the imperialist-backed tyranny that actually exists right now. This is of course a relash of the Menshevik/Stalinist dogma of "two-stage" revolution, the "main enemy is fascism, imperialism, feudalism, what have you. A mobilization against the Iranian bourgeoisie-leaving the Islamic clergy by the toiling masses can wait—

"In order to fight for these demands the Bolsheviks called for the extension of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party. This was a front on the tsarist regime by a Russian revolution-in which a demonstration of the proletariat; the lowly priest himself be carried by the waves."

Trotsky, 1905

The shah's last bases of support: left with Carter during his visit. Troops (below) continue on Teheran University protests.

For these latter-day Kautsky the constituent assembly becomes the central axis of the Revolution. Here is how Feldman summarizes the Bolshevik strategy:

They counted on the independent mobilization of the workers, peasants, and soldiers to topple the tsar—not the liberal bourgeoisie-leftist coalition of the Mensheviks or "united front" of the Social Democrats. They called for an end to Russian participation in the imperial war and for the immediate disbanding of the land among the peasants. And they campaigned for the speedy conviction of the constituent assembly to assure the realization of their program by a democratically chosen one.

"In order to fight for these demands the Bolsheviks called for extending the struggle by forming an-alliance of other workers and soldiers with the masses in their struggle throughout the country. They urged the working class and passivity to rely on their own organs.

But even this restatement of Menshevism has little to do with the SWP's position on Iran. By contrast the Menshevik and bourgeois-left bourgeois smell as sweet as a rose. The current opposition in Iran is a reactionary clerical one which bears no resemblance whatsoever to the democratic opposition to the tsar. A more appropriate analogy would be if the Russian Orthodox clergy had gone into...
The Organizational Question in Classical Marxism

Marxism and the Jacobin Communist Tradition, Part XV

But when the imperial mantle finally falls on the shoulders of Louis Bonaparte, the bronze statue of Napoleon will come crashing down from the top of the Vendôme Column.

—Karl Marx, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon

Introduction

EDITOR'S NOTE: As a special feature Young Spartacus has been publishing the Presentations on the origins of Marxism that have been given by Joseph Seymour of the Spartacist League Central Committee at various educational gatherings of the SYL.

The current installment, the second of three on the Organizational Question in Classical Marxism, represents the conclusion of the series on Marxism and the Jacobin Communist Tradition and the bridge to the series on Lenin and the Vanguard Party, which was published in Workers Vanguard. The three articles on this topic are based on a public presentation by comrade Seymour in New York City on July 15 of this year. In this series comrade Seymour has set out to demonstrate how Marx and Engels assimilated the political world views and experiences of the preceding generations of revolutionary militants and the red scare following the Bolsheviki Revolution. Marx's passionate and powerful defense of his work turned the fury of bourgeois reaction against the International. The International was made up of those organizing the commune, although in reality there was virtually no organization at all. The name became a household name overnight. The bourgeoisie press blew Marx up as the demagogue of the European revolution, who sitting in London could command thousands of fanatical communists to assasinate governments. To John Peterbo, Marx himself was berusurced by his sudden notoriety. As he wrote (18 June 1871) to his friend Ludwig Kugelmann:

"It [The Civil War in France] is making the devil of a noise and I have the honour to be at this moment the best calumetted and most menaced man of London. That really does one good after a tedious twenty years' idyll in my den."

—Karl Marx, Letters to Dr. Kugelmann (1834)

Marxism and the International

Before the publication of The Civil War in France, the International was not—and was not seen as—a Marxist organization, and this in two senses. One, it did not have a specific program. The International never called for collectivization of industrial capital, nor any further than the nationalization of land and public utilities such as railroads, canals, etc.

Another overwhelming majority of leading figures in the International did not view themselves as followers of Marx, politically or organizationally. In fact, when Marx suddenly became publicly notorious in late 1871, many of the British trade unionists in the International said they had been unaware that he was a communist. And the leading British trade unionists and John Hales were mass leaders of organizations whose members were not even socialists. They collaborated with Marx on a strictly equal footing. The leading British trade unionists and John Hales asserted in response to the accusation that Marx was the dictatoral leader of the International:

"...there are no official subordinates to Dr. Marx on our Council. He is secretary for Germany, and would as

who struggled to achieve an egalitarian-collectivist social order by ensuring the triumph of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. In stressing the living continuity of the Jacobin communist tradition and the active influence on the young Marx and Engels, the series debunks the currently fashionable New Left academic appropriation of Jacobinism as simply a self-contained armchair derivation from Hegelian philosophy.

Previous articles in the series have covered: The Great French Revolution...
DECEMBER 1978/JANUARY 1979

very the International, the main continental leaders of the Interna-
tional viewed themselves as peers of Marx and Engels with given positions in the International. For example, the leader of the section in Germany-Switzerland, Johann Philipp Becker, cooperated closely with Marx in the first period of the International, then supported Bakunin for a time, and then returned to Marx's side in the final factional showdown. Similarly, the leading French socialist César de Perpe, played an intermediate role in the Marx-Bakunin fight.

**Tactics and Strategy**

Marx and Engels had initially disagreed on the question of participation in the First International. Marx maintained that the political heterogeneity of the assembled groups would prove to be its political undoing, while Engels, however, was apparently more impressed with the involvement of the central mass-based political and union organizations of Europe and felt that the International would provide political access to the key proletarian centers of Europe. The difference between Marx and Engels on this question was a tactical one: would this be just another of the exile "international"ss (as Engels maintained) or would this be an organizational vehicle for their program?

Marx's belief that the natural evolution of the advanced sectors of the working class would result in the acceptance of his program led him to put all his energies into the First International in order to maintain his bloc with the British trade unions and German exiles. The Paris Commune, however, superceded the question of tactical alliances in France. In consequence, and in a sense the First International itself. The Commune was, as Marx expressed it in The Civil War in France, "essentially a working-class government, the produce of the struggle against the exploiting class, and its last and victorious defense, which we put under which to work out the economic emancipation of labour."

This positing of the strategic question of the International was the power of the tactical alliances that Marx had put together for the International. In fact the prominence he gained by his defense of the Commune (and by his criticisms of it) brought Marx's ideas far more currency than had the entire period of the Internationale. His resolution of the Central Committee, which was without any doubt the organizational core of the International, which was without any doubt the social weight of the International, which was without any doubt the organization of the First International, which was without any doubt the leading body of the workers movement, continued by its own admission, to the Bakuninists, supported Marx against Bakunin because they believed in a solid, centralized organization and in the importance of state power in the transition to socialism. The British trade unionists who supported Marx did so out of a loyalist, conservative attitude toward the International, and a feeling that the programme laid down in the congress refused to expel the Blanquists or would this be an anarchist socialist program. Significantly, Marx's collaboration with these trade unionists did not survive the collapse of the International.

Three out of the six days of the Hague Congress were taken up with disputes over delegate credentials — i.e., who was entitled to vote. In itself, this showed that the organization had in large measure already disintegrated. Marx and Engels had maintained that the necessity for a new International was solid, but it was not solid. Bakunin was expelled from the International for attempting to produce it, and for which the Spanish Bakunists delegation, since this would clearly violate the accepted principle that the International was open to all working-class tendencies.

Even the immediate impact of the publication of The Civil War in France was the resignation in protest of two of the leading British trade unionists, George Odger and Benjamin Lucy. The other left-liberal German exiles, it appears, did not resign, but many withdrew from active involvement in the International. In 1871, after the Franco-Prussian war, the leadership of the International was attacked from many sides.

The basic lesson which Marx and Engels drew from the results of the Congress was that the International was that it is not possible to lead an organization, except conjunctures, where we can get a majority of its activities do not adhere to one's program and political outlook. In a letter (12 September 1874) to the leading German-American Marxist, Friedrich Engels assessed the historic significance of the International and commented that "Menschenrecht und Befreiung der proletarischen Klasse, resurgent communism and social democracy". Marx's lasting contribution was the establishment of a new International. Engels begins by noting that the unity of the International, the German Social Democratic Party, was conditioned by the weakness of the European workers movement which was, after the triumph of counterrevolution in 1848, far weaker than it had been.

"[The International] belonged to the period of the Second Empire of Napoleon III, during which the opposition reigning throughout Europe pressed unity and abolition from all its internal policies to the workers' movements, just as it did in the First. It was the moment when the common cosmopolitan interests of the proletariat

Working men's Paris, with its Commune, will be for ever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its leaders are enshrined in history. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal history from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them.

—Karl Marx, The Civil War in France

"Meanwhile our Association has made great progress... And in the next revolutionary form..." (emphasis in original)

"The Commune caused Marx to put his revolutionary communist views to the fore, his leadership of the International was attacked from many sides.

The basic lesson which Marx and Engels drew from the results of the Congress was that the International was that it is not possible to lead an organization, except conjunctures, where we can get a majority of its activities do not adhere to one's program and political outlook. In a letter (12 September 1874) to the leading German-American Marxist, Friedrich Engels assessed the historic significance of the International and commented that "Menschenrecht und Befreiung der proletarischen Klasse, resurgent communism and social democracy". Marx's lasting contribution was the establishment of a new International. Engels begins by noting that the unity of the International, the German Social Democratic Party, was conditioned by the weakness of the European workers movement which was, after the triumph of counterrevolution in 1848, far weaker than it had been.

"[The International] belonged to the period of the Second Empire of Napoleon III, during which the opposition reigning throughout Europe pressed unity and abolition from all its internal policies to the workers' movements, just as it did in the First. It was the moment when the common cosmopolitan interests of the proletariat

Working men's Paris, with its Commune, will be for ever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its leaders are enshrined in history. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal history from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them.

—Karl Marx, The Civil War in France

"Meanwhile our Association has made great progress... And in the next revolutionary form..." (emphasis in original)

"The Commune caused Marx to put his revolutionary communist views to the fore, his leadership of the International was attacked from many sides.

The basic lesson which Marx and Engels drew from the results of the Congress was that the International was that it is not possible to lead an organization, except conjunctures, where we can get a majority of its activities do not adhere to one's program and political outlook. In a letter (12 September 1874) to the leading German-American Marxist, Friedrich
Carter... (continued from page 12)

The only item which is sure to be provided the union bureaucrats with a reason to offer their ranks for failing to fight for hefty wage increases and full cost-of-living raises. Real wages fell 20.4 percent during the strike and layoffs and factory shut-downs continued to ravage key industrial sectors, and this trend is certain to continue. The Carter administration's obvious weakness during the coal strike and the manifestly inadequate guidelines will not get the trade-union tops off the hot seat. For one thing, the guidelines are not enough. Behind a smokescreen of outraged bluster AFL-CIO chief George Meany's opposition to the guidelines is nothing but an argument for full-scale mandatory wage controls to the extent that the government will pass on no responsibility for inflation-caused pay cuts off the bureaucracy altogether.

UAW workers have clearly not recon­ ciled themselves to living with 6 percent unemployment (far higher among mi­ nority and youth) and double-digit inflation. Although 1978 was not a major bargaining year for the biggest unions, the level of labor strife was extremely high. The year began with the miners' strike. Only bureaucratic sabotage and the threat of a City transit strike in the spring. Wheat farmers shut down major Post Office facilities on both coasts. Eighty thousand railroad and paper workers struck 12 Northwest firms in August and when fall arrived so did a steady stream of impressive propor­ tions. California Teamsters took on the giant producers and teachers walked out in every part of the country. New York City printing trade workers on strike for 23 percent for 88 days from August to October and railroad clerks tied up the country's rail traffic for a week in September, defying court injunctions.

From the invocation of the Taft­Hartley law (slave labor bill) against the miners to the tacit threat of National Guard intervention against a nationwide anti-nuke struggle, Carter's government has not hesitated to use repressive measures in one every of the major nations. The obvious displays of repression, and whose declared open season on the standard of living of the working class with the economic and political crisis, the official threat to institute mandatory controls should the "voluntary" measures fail to control inflation.

Meanwhile the labor fakers are valiantly trying to save him the trouble. Teamsters and Communications Workers, whose master freight agreement expires in March, has okayed the guidelines with just enough nationalization of the obvious threat to institute mandatory controls should the "voluntary" measures fail to control inflation.
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symbol of female bondage, are considered profoundly shocking.

Khomeni’s “just rule of Islam” would institutionalize religious intolerance. The Society of Iranian Clergymen based in Tehran, subsequently, organized the demands for the revocation of “all non-Islamic laws.” Freedom only for “religious principles,” in accordance with the Principles of Bahai (a minority religious sect) from government office and the restructuring of the educational system. The Holocaust is based in Tehran, attained the Stolypin law, for example, from which the Sarajevo of the commando. They are not independent of this, and the anti-imperialist political leadership, no force advancing a program for workers rule.

The SWP’s response to the strike wave clearly showed their appetite for betrayal, expressed as it was through the Militant’s insipid, semi-political journal, Down with the Shah’s Butchery! No confidence in the bureaucratic state. A proletarian alternative to Khomeni is completely alien to them.

The future of the shah’s despotic rule is changing in the balance. The vast machinery of repression has proved unable to quell the immense outpouring of popular hatred for the regime. With the crisis of the Iranian monarchy the possibility for the proletariat to deal with all its oppressors is posed. Now is the time for the Iranian workers to smash through the rotten class rule of both the Pahlavi and the mululls, sweeping away all the miserable power of the torture chambers, centen­naires of religious superstition and oppression, the grinding exploitation of imperialist-dominated Iranian capitalism. And the major­ity Socialist victory of the Iranian proletariat could be the spark for socialist revolution in the entire region.

Devolution (continued from page 3)

Indonesian leftists await execution in mass grave, 1965.

The dirge of a proletarian axis can be seen in the massive strike battles waged by the Iranian workers. When the oil workers shut down Iran’s central industry, raising a series of democratic and economic demands, the strike’s impact was felt not only in Tehran, but throughout the world. In many cases the strikers have held back from joining the religious protests; at the same time, their quest to be where the Militant’s call to smash the apartheid regime! is completely alien to them.

The future of the shah’s despotic rule is changing in the balance. The vast machinery of repression has proved unable to quell the immense outpouring of popular hatred for the regime. With the crisis of the Iranian monarchy the possibility for the proletariat to deal with all its oppressors is posed. Now is the time for the Iranian workers to smash through the rotten class rule of both the Pahlavi and the mululls, sweeping away all the miserable power of the torture chambers, centuries of religious superstition and oppression, the grinding exploitation of imperialist-dominated Iranian capitalism. And the majority Socialist victory of the Iranian proletariat could be the spark for socialist revolution in the entire region.

SWP... (continued from page 5)

opposition over the Stolypin land reforms, for example, from which the Sarajevo of the commando. They are not independent of this, and the anti-imperialist political leadership, no force advancing a program for workers rule.

The SWP’s response to the strike wave clearly showed their appetite for betrayal, expressed as it was through the Militant’s insipid, semi-political journal, Down with the Shah’s Butchery! No confidence in the bureaucratic state. A proletarian alternative to Khomeni is completely alien to them.

The future of the shah’s despotic rule is changing in the balance. The vast machinery of repression has proved unable to quell the immense outpouring of popular hatred for the regime. With the crisis of the Iranian monarchy the possibility for the proletariat to deal with all its oppressors is posed. Now is the time for the Iranian workers to smash through the rotten class rule of both the Pahlavi and the mululls, sweeping away all the miserable power of the torture chambers, centuries of religious superstition and oppression, the grinding exploitation of imperialist-dominated Iranian capitalism. And the majority Socialist victory of the Iranian proletariat could be the spark for socialist revolution in the entire region.

The Militant (1 December) “explains” this in the name of hands-off imperialism. “Only the African masses, in the course of their struggle, can forge new policies that represent their aspirations. For Americans to single out one or another liberation group in Africa as a model, all a variation of the right to black Africans to choose their own leaderships.”

The Militant and New Lefters, who merely seek to pressure the very same politicians only with a more “militant” program, lost the opportunity to vote for the YSA. When a second attempt to insert support for the “liberal” position was found wanting, as well, the Maosists threatened a walk-out of the conference and the rest of the plenum agenda was suspended. Confer­ence participants were treated to the spectacle of several hundred Maosists lined up on either side of an issue demanding a full political discussion and complaining about the trampling of their democratic rights—in effect redbait­ing the SWP/YSA for “unlike themselves” and “bourgeois.” The SWP sat uneasy, by having maintained organizational control of this latest “coalition” of the gangster WVO and RSB (who had previously engaged in a bit of “political assassination” by ki­lling any real enemies in Eng­land’s literature trade) their posings as victims of bureaucracy and political suppression rings hollow.

The Maosists’ posture as left anti­imperialist militants had no more to do with the lack of trust—along with China—supported the South African invasion of Angola and refused to call for the military defeat of imperialism against the Soviet-backed MPLA or to denounce South Africa’s bureaucracy’s long-standing friendship with the shah of Iran, their “anti­imperialist” credentials—indeed their loss when they accepted and apologized for China’s alliance with U.S. imperialists in the struggle against the Soviet de­generate workers state.

The ex-Trotskyist SWP/YSA tried to simply argue for “unity” and ducked the question of support—military or political—to the nationalist. The only attempt to come up with a united front was the speech given by Tony Thomas in which he hailed the “revolu­tionary force” of Castro’s Cuba in Africa. As an SYL, a spokesman at the plenary session pointed out, the SWP’s support for the MPLA and the Ethiopian Derg (the brutal oppressors of Eritrea) along with their scandalous pro­motions of “support for Black Africa” makes its claim to be spoken for anti-racist struggle as ludicrous as that of the Militant.

To those serious about fighting against apartheid, or the struggle between black Africa and southern Africa, the road forward is in the long and hard fight to mobilize the masses of the black worker, the proletariat in alliance with the interna­tional working class to smash apart­heid, imperialism and other suppress­ive regimes. Not even the assembled “sell-out” enthusiasts of SWP/YSA or the shach of the Militant can stop the continued round of deviation activ­ities.

The standard line of the SWP, that it will not and cannot be united with the pseudo-­revolutionaries in Eritrea, makes them look like the real “socialists” who have already fundamentally betrayed the most basic antiracist and internationalist principles.
BU Strikers Take On Madman Silber

When the proud families of Boston University (B.U.) students arrived at the George Sherman Union on November 7 they were undoubtedly surprised to discover that they had to wade through piles of garbage and cross a picket line in order to participate in Parent's Weekend activities. Unfortunately, however, it was not only the parents who crossed the lines of the University's strike. B.U. workers during the week-long strike discovered that they had to wade through garbage, cross a picket line, and function as usual with most classes meeting. This situation met with the general approval of the majority of those who allegedly supported the strike.

The General Council, appointed by the B.U. Student Union president John Silber to submit all union matters to an increasing number of students, proposed a resolution to solve B.U.'s financial problems at the expense of its student body and staff. In this particular case, the administration sought the right to capriciously alter work schedules, restrict sick leaves and mandate heavy labor.

The union-busting Silber has run roughshod over the rights of B.edu. He has attempted to break up unions, censured and, in some cases, destroyed students and workers who crossed the lines of the University to an extent of its student body and staff. In addition, this committee issued leaflets which condemned working for the university as long as work normally done by B&G was left untouched.

The character of the strike support committee was significantly altered during a pathetic attempt at militancy, a confrontation with Silber which followed November 7 rally. Faculty and students, with Kenmore Square's most notorious tyrant, these supposed radicals could do nothing but be mocked, defamed, and subjected to abuse for 45 minutes. In a similar vein, strike support by other campus unions was limited to a one-hour extension of lunch on November 7, while a rally was held on campus.

The strike ended with acceptance of the future organization of society, Marx's basic principles of the workers movement: labor trade unionism, mutualism and anarchism. Against the liberal trade unionists, centrally in Britain, Marx posed the need for an independent workers party organized on the principles of the marked properties. From the 1850's on he and Engels fought to break the British trade unions from the Gladstonian Liberals. For example, a resolution which Marx/Engels presented to an 1871 conference of the First International in London stated:

"...against this collective power of the properied class the working class cannot act, as a class, only constituting itself into a political party, distinct from and opposed to all old parties formed by the properied classes."

The General Council of the First International 1870-1871 (1964)

Secondly, especially in light of the fact the General Council of the First International, Marx/Engels recognized that the majority of European working-class radicals did not understand their doctrines, even in elementary form. Thus, they composed some lengthy period propaganda pamphlets and pedagogical and political activity as a precondition for the establishment of an international Marxist movement.

Karl Marx.

"...against this collective power of the properied class the working class cannot act, as a class, only constituting itself into a political party, distinct from and opposed to all old parties formed by the properied classes."
came on August 13, 1977 in the London confrontation with the police who the counter-mobilization became a borough of Lewisham, when 500-strong NF march through this later became a Communist.

Our Cable fascism in that period. Since the electioneering with provocative street sects to form the National Front (NF), the fascist movement in Britain has re­

"It was obvious that the fascists and the police would have their attention on the Cable Street. We were ready. The moment this became apparent the signal was given to put up the barri­

"and one took a helmet for his son as a"

A direct consequence of the Cable Street rout was a marked decline in fascist activity in that period. Since the late 1960s' NFs, however, the fascist movement in Britain has re­

"No Support to the ANL!"

From the outset, the Spartacist League remained refused to tail after the ANL, uniquely denouncing it as a battle to win over its proletarian base. When the reformist and centrist left appeal to the state to ban fascists they conceal the attempt to mobilize fascists in the working class, the ANL Party officials who send out the cops in droves to protect the fascist rallies. The battle must mobilize two masses of British unionists, the Labour Party's files, to deal a death blow to the fascist scum.
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"Mass movements are important

but there's an interesting thing that Trotsky said years ago: mass movements are different from mass movements. So the imperialist invasion of the Soviet Union a mass movement. The bombing of Hiroshima was a mass movement. The Anti Nazi League Carnival was also a mass movement, but so was Cable Street in 1936. And that's the spirit we stand on. That's what we say should have happened. On that day the Communist Party wanted to go to Talafra Square. But they made it against the East and the fascists were routed. The SWP and the IMG can't even claim that. We made that happen.

In his summary, Tanaka took issue with this classic reformist argument, not one of a revolution, a civil war but one of a revolution, a civil war.

"So who was behind the Anti Nazi League?" they asked. "They're behind the fascists, and that's not true, because they're respectable. Because they're respectable, because they want to be respectable."
A Gallup poll taken in early August found that only 39 percent of the American people held a "favorable" opinion of Jimmy Carter's performance as president. Although his sponsorship of a "spurious" separate peace in the Near East between Egypt and Israel has temporarily boosted Carter's popularity, the political future of the Georgia peanut boss is questionable at best. The black and labor constituency which put him in office has turned against him. The overwhelmingly Democratic Congress can barely muster enough support for the Democratic president to pass his priority legislation. Carter's chances of avoiding a one-term presidency now seem directly tied to the ever-slimmer chances of avoiding a severe economic recession in 1979.

The illusions which Carter's "outsider" image inspired in the electorate in 1976 wore off quickly once the "born again" president took office. His media-manufactured reputation as an anti-Washington establishment politician had attracted the half-hearted support of voters whose only solid commitment was to cynical and apolitical apathy. The draw-out defeat in Indochina and the scandal of Watergate have fostered such widespread cynicism about politics that the president's approval rating stands at only 37 percent of the eligible voters even bothered to cast a ballot last month. This figure, as the Economist (11 November) pointed out, puts the U.S. above only Botswana in a global ranking of electoral enthusiasm among "democratic" countries.

The "outsider" label was always phony. Carter was, in reality, the first-round pick of David Rockefeller's "Trilateral Commission" of elite think tankers, among them Cyrus Vance, Zbigniew Brzezinski and others now in Carter's cabinet. It was their anti-Soviet schemes which Carter translated into the language of "human rights" diplomacy, a policy which the Administration's whole-hearted support to the bloody-handed shah of Iran and other neo-colonial despot's has exposed as a threadbare cover for cold-war anti-communism.

The most disillusioned among Carter's 1976 backers are the black voters, whose 90 percent Democratic loyalty may well have provided him the margin of victory over Jerry Ford. In return for their support the "ethnic purity" president has given oppressed blacks precisely nothing. In fact, the social services which have been the traditional stock of Democratic politicians to the black ghettos are being cut back to the tune of $5 billion this year and $15 billion in 1980. This move has drawn howls of outrage from the black Democrats whose own careers depend upon brokered for federal funds and maintaining a legion of followers among the poverty pimps and "community" hustlers.

The trade-union bureaucrats who mustered their membership behind Carter's candidacy two years ago are finding it hard to convince American workers of the benefits derived from this "friend of labor" administration. Every item on their legislative agenda, from sit-down picketing to the "Labor Reform Bill," has gone down in defeat in the Democratic Congress.

If the traditional Democratic coalition has disintegrated, so has the image of Jimmy Carter's, the U.S. ruling class is equally displeased. The explosive miners' strike of last winter, in which a militant rank and file defied the courts, American government and their own senior management for 11 months and halted the coal operators' union-busting offensive, was an object lesson in the class struggle for both the American workers and bourgeoisie. With the threat of massive layoffs on the horizon and with a weak Administration trying to push through an anti-labor austerity program, 1979 will undoubtedly be a year of intensified class battles. Carter's recession policies of an administration which is courting a depression in the working class and now doubt that Carter has the ability to squelch the struggles of labor's rank and file.

Thus Carter's announcement of wage and price guidelines only touched off a further run on the dollar internationally and lower closings on the stock market domestically. With the political climate such that his other measures were not taken seriously, Carter was forced to turn to massive foreign borrowing to prop up the dollar and tight money policies at home. While a recession next year may well have been inevitable; the Administration's fiscal policies only exacerbate the conjunctural tendencies in that direction.

Recession Ahead in 1979

The context for the coming labor struggles is an economy which most bourgeois economic commentators now agree is quite likely heading for recession in 1979. The capitalist mouthpieces are only now facing up to the fact that the U.S. economy's recovery from the depression of 1974-75 was extremely weak and based not on a real upturn in capital investment but on an unprecogulated consumer borrowing binge. The growth of massive consumer debt was encouraged by inflation which produced cheapened real interest rates on auto, home and other installment loans.

Now, however, the spending spree is over. The volume of consumer goods sold remained flat between August and October and capital spending, stagnating at an estimated 2 percent growth rate for 1978, will not take up the slack. (Figures cited in Business Week, 13 and 27 November 1978). Carter's recent moves to raise interest rates will only accelerate the cutback in consumer spending and quicken the onset of the inevitable downturn in the capitalist business cycle. As Business Week (13 November) warned before Carter's new tight money measures went into effect: "if it [the Federal Reserve Bank] tightens the credit reins further, a recession as bad as—or far worse than— that of 1974 may follow since it will be more costly, if not impossible, to sustain the borrowing spree."

Carter's wage guidelines, budget cutbacks and interest rate hikes are the policies of an administration which is consciously courting a depression in order to put the cost of halting the decline of the dollar on the back of the working class. That the Administration knows exactly what it is doing was made clear by Carter-appointed anti-inflation "czar" Alfred E. Kahn's clear statement several weeks ago that if Carter's program does not work out according to his optimistic projections, the result will be a "deep, deep depression."

For months the U.S. government allowed the dollar to fall precipitously against foreign currencies in an attempt to increase export competitiveness. But the price of improving the U.S. balance of trade in this way was a tumbling stock market, the threat of an OPEC oil price rise and inflation which has now reached the 10 percent level. Accordingly, last spring Carter made a half-hearted turn away from the policy of "malign neglect" of the dollar (see "Behind the Dollar Crisis" in Workers Vanguard No. 204, 5 May 1978). But only in the last two months has the Administration moved in earnest to reverse the former policies. The first step was the announcement on October 24 of the "Phase II" wage and price guidelines in which Carter urged the unions to keep their wage and benefit increases to 7 percent in 1979, a figure far below the inflation rate. The "price guidelines" are completely phony, allowing companies, in wage-price administrator Barry Bosworth's words, to "interpret the standards for themselves." The wage guidelines, on the other hand, are formally more restrictive than Nixon's infamous wage controls because they include all benefit increases and not just pay boosts in the 7 percent limit.

No one, however, takes the 7 percent figure seriously. Existing labor contracts have built in much higher rates in pay and fringes and Bosworth is now planning some "softening" of the limit on benefits. But even though the 7 percent figure will most likely not last through the first round of contract negotiations, this is nonetheless a weapon aimed at labor to hold down wages.

The companion fiscal policy to Carter's wage guidelines came with the announcement of deep cuts in the 1980 budget. As one anonymous "top Administration official" put it, "We are not going to maintain current services. We will have to cut some programs, delay others, and terminate some." (Business Week, 13 November 1978). On the chopping block are Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) jobs, housing funds, sewage treatment and other supposedly "uncontrollable" expenses such as Medicare, Social Security and federal pensions.

In the center of this economic quagmire is the question of the future of the Carter presidency. Jimmy Carter is the first president in almost 20 years to leave office with his political and personal embarrassment equal to or greater than that of his predecessor. Whether Jimmy Carter is merely the first of a new generation of one-term presidents, or whether we are on the brink of an era of constantly renewed short-term presidencies, will be decided by the outcome of the next election.