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In Brief

‘MOCKERY OF JUSTICE’ IN STARSKY CASE. In 1972 a U.S. district court ruled that the constitutional rights of Arizona State University Prof. Morris Starksy had been violated when he was fired from his job because of his socialist views and activities. But on December 30, a federal court-appointed official decided not to order the ASU president to reinstate Starksy.

Starksy had been a tenure professor at ASU’s department of philosophy. He was fired in 1970—a victim of an FBI-organized campaign of dirty tricks. The ASU faculty committee on academic freedom and tenure unanimously opposed his dismissal.

Starksy branded the December 30 ruling “a mockery of justice.” He asked, ‘What do constitutional rights mean in the United States anyway? The reigns fire some for his political views, the courts even recognize that this was a violation of free speech rights. But the court does not rule that he be given his job back!”

Starksy will appeal the decision.

FBI burglar jailed

On January 5 Timothy Redfearn became the first FBI burglar to be indicted, convicted, and sentenced to prison. Redfearn was sentenced by Denver district court judge Robert Fullerton to an indeterminate-to-ten-year term in the Colorado State Reformatory in Buena Vista. Redfearn was indicted after his arrest for burglarizing documents from the offices of the Denver Socialist Workers party last July 7. He had pleaded guilty January 3 to second-degree burglary charges.

When Fullerton asked Redfearn, who had worked as a government informer against the SWP, if the FBI had been involved in the SWP burglary, Redfearn answered yes. This contradicts FBI statements at the time claiming that Redfearn acted on his own.

On December 27, Redfearn had also been sentenced to an indeterminate-to-twelve-year sentence at Buena Vista on other charges of burglarizing several thousand dollars worth of guns from a private home. Several other burglary charges against Redfearn were dropped after he pleaded guilty in the SWP burglary case.

SURVEY ON SPANISH-SPEAKING U.S. POPULATION: A federal report released in December revealed new information on discrimination against the 11.1 million people of Spanish-speaking origin estimated by the Census Bureau to live in the United States. The bureau—whose survey methods underscore the Spanish-speaking populatation and overestimate its average income—says it found 6.6 million people of Mexican descent, 1.8 million of Puerto Rican background, and 897,000 of Cuban origin in the United States as of June 1975. The balance were from other Spanish-speaking backgrounds.

The Census Bureau says this represents an increase of one-half million since 1973 and now accounts for 5.3 percent of the population.

Median 1975 income for Spanish-speaking families was reported to be $9,551. Median income for families describing backgrounds, was reported at $14,268. Black family median income was reported at $8,779.

Unemployment figures for March 1975 were listed as 11.5 percent for Spanish-speaking, 6.8 percent for whites, and about 13 percent for Blacks.

The report showed that Spanish-speaking family incomes were 71.2 percent of white family incomes in 1974, but dropped even further to 66.9 percent in 1975.

Nearly 27 percent of the population of Spanish-speaking origin had incomes below the federally defined poverty level. This compared to 9.7 percent of whites and 31.3 percent of Blacks.

COOK COUNTY NURSES END STRIKE: Striking nurses at Chicago’s Cook County and Oak Forest hospitals voted December 10 to end their thirty-eight-day strike against the Cook County Health and Hospital Governing Commission.

The nurses walked off the job November 3 when the governing commission moved to eliminate the twelve paid sick days the nurses received each year.

The settlement approved by the nurses allows only 25 percent pay for the first day of any sick leave. While losing on this key issue, the nurses did win a 7 percent wage increase retroactive to July 1, improved family health insurance, and a guarantee they would not be transferred to specialty units for which they are not adequately trained.

These gains were won through a militant struggle that overcame considerable difficulties. These included the withdrawal of support for the strike by the Illinois Nurses’ Association under threat of heavy court fines. Threats of firings and deportations were also used against strikers.

BLACK MARINE SENTENCED AT CAMP PENDLETON: Cpl. E.F. Henry was sentenced by a military court December 29 to three months at hard labor, a reduction in pay of $150 a month for four months, and demotion to private. Henry is one of thirteen Black marines currently on trial at Camp Pendleton after a November 13 attack on what they thought was a Ku Klux Klan meeting.

SPECIAL STEEL ISSUE: Next week’s Militant will feature expanded coverage of the election campaign in the United Steelworkers of America and Ed Sadowski’s challenge to the union bureaucracy. To join in plant-gate sales of this special issue, contact the Socialist Workers party branch nearest you (see Socialist Workers Directory, page 31) or order copies at 18¢ each from the Militant Business Office, 14 Charles Lane, New York, New York 10014.
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The fight for union democracy in the United Steelworkers of America will affect the future of the entire labor movement. For coverage of the upcoming USWA elections . . . Ed Sadowski’s challenge to the Abel bureaucracy . . . struggles for jobs, decent wages, and safe working conditions—subscribe to the Militant.
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Oil disasters expose greed on high seas

By Diane Rupp

President Ford came out for statehood for Puerto Rico December 31.

By Steve Wattenmaker

Just hours after Transportation Secretary William D. Graham delivered his speech on the need for reform of the oil spill laws, the U.S. military killed at least one human being in the West Bank.

PSP emphasized that Puerto Ricans had to control their own dignity, "necessary for economic survival. statehood will benefit Puerto Rico by the government, she said. But she cans voted for commonwealth status Puerto Ricans to take care of their own because they feared that some kind of population. Independence-not statehood-for Puerto Rico December 31. would Puerto Rico fare without the some significance in the victory of
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YSA leader hits Ford proposal

Independence—not statehood—for Puerto Rico

By Diane Rupp

President Ford came out for statehood for Puerto Rico December 31.

So the next day, when Puerto Rican activist and Young Socialist Alliance leader Andrea Labrano appeared at a press conference during the YSA convention, it was natural for reporters to ask him about it. Labrano is a newly elected member of the YSA National Executive Committee.

"This is just an attempt to maintain the oppression of Puerto Rico," Labrano said. "Puerto Rico is a colony of the U.S., and we have just an attempt to cover up the colonial status and to continue making profits from Puerto Rico."

Labrano pointed out that Puerto Ricans had voted overwhelmingly against becoming a state when the issue appeared on the ballot in 1967.

"Didn't they vote overwhelmingly to remain a colony, like," a reporter from a Chicago TV station pressed.

Labrano answered that Puerto Ricans voted overwhelmingly against statehood because they feared that some kind of attachment to the United States was necessary for economic survival.

"Eat with humility or starve with dignity," is the way the issue is posed by the YSA, he said. "There is no reason to think that the country would act to take care of their own population.

"You're saying you don't think statehood will benefit Puerto Rico?" the reporter asked.

"No, I don't," Labrano answered. "We've asked the right of Puerto Ricans to control their own country." "Independence?" asked the newsm.

"Yes," she answered.

"Wrong with U.S. citizen ship?" the reporter asked. "It gave Puerto Ricans the right to come and go as they please."

Labrano answered him, "Wouldn't it have been better to let them be citizens of Puerto Rico?"

NEW YORK—Two Puerto Rican independence groups condemned Ford's statehood proposal.

Natasha López, who brought greetings to the Young Socialist Alliance convention from Puerto Rico's Trotskyist group, the Liga Internacional de los Trabajadores, told the Militant: "The declaration made by Ford reflects very clearly the United States's violation of our people's right of self-determination. Ford's statement underlines Puerto Rico's colonial status."

Some news articles have tried to find some significance in the victory of Carlos Romero Barceló, Puerto Rico's new governor, who ran as the candidate of the pro-statehood New Progressive party, in the last election.

López commented, "Barceló won because his campaign did not focus on the issue of statehood, but on solving the economic problems facing the country. The election results cannot be interpreted as a desire of our people to make Puerto Rico a state, but as a protest against the economic situation manifested in the high unemployment rate and the rise in the cost of living." The U.S. section of the Puerto Rican Socialist party also criticized Ford's statement.

"The only responsible and honorable measure the United States can take," a PFP statement said, is to adopt the bill introduced into Congress by Rep. Bon D'Allums (D-Calif.) last summer. That bill would require the United States to recognize Puerto Rican independence.

"The only solution to the question of the status of Puerto Rico is the exercise of full self-determination and full sovereignty," said the PFP statement. "Only in this way can Puerto Rican people face the serious political, economic, social, and cultural problems that are the direct result of colonial dependency and plunder to which we have been subjected by the transnational monopolies."

Gov't whitewashes wiretaps

What is wiretapping?

Just an improved telephone ser- vices according to the Puerto Rican government.

An official inquiry into telephone wiretaps in Puerto Rico claims the government was only part of the telephone company's "quality control" program, not political spying. It was quite an unusual "quality control" program. According to one source, the government requested access to all lines of a third of this total through spillage and the widespread practice of flush- ing out their giant tanks before reload-
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Socialist challenges Bradley for L.A. mayor

By Sherry Smith

LOS ANGELES—The Socialist Workers party here has named Sam Manuel as its candidate in the 1977 mayoral election. Manuel is a twenty-seven-year-old Black activist and founding member of the National Student Coalition Against Racism.

In previous elections, Bradley is one of Manuel’s major opponents in the race. Bradley, a former cop and city councilman, was elected in 1973. Newspapers hailed the election of a Black mayor in the nation’s third-largest city as a giant step forward for Black Americans.

In Manuel’s opinion, however, Bradley is not a good cop or a good city councilman. He is one of Manuel’s major opponents in the race. Bradley, a former cop and city councilman, was elected in 1973. Newspapers hailed the election of a Black mayor in the nation’s third-largest city as a giant step forward for Black Americans.

In Manuel’s opinion, however, Bradley is not a good cop or a good city councilman. He has never been arrested for anything.

Los Angeles has one of the most segregated school systems in the country. The Los Angeles Times reported last spring that 292 of the city’s 1,600 public schools have more than 50 percent minority enrollment. Of those 292 schools, 157 have 97 percent or higher minority enrollment.

In the four years that Los Angeles has had a Black mayor, the schools have become more—not less—segregated, while continuing to deteriorate.

State Senator Alan Robbins has joined the race for mayor as an antibusing candidate. Robbins represents the San Fernando Valley area, where racial whites have organized an antibusing group named Bustop.

Bringing his candidacy, Robbins told the Los Angeles Times that “forced busing is going to bring racial disunity to the community, and what the city has needed over the last two or three years is a more than a candidate who can lead the city forward.”

Robbins also plans to run a “law and order” campaign against incumbent Bradley. “Law and order” is a small “rape whistle” that he is handing out by the thousands.

Victory: Attica Brothers win clemency at last

By Willie Mae Reid

On December 30, 1976, Gov. Hugh Carey announced that he was granting clemency to the 80 Attica defendants and all others involved in the 1971 prison rebellion. In response to consumer pressures, some parties for the Attica brothers, Carey moved to “firmly and finally close the book on this unhappy chapter of our [state] history.”

Carey said he was accepting the recommendations of special prosecutor Alfred Scotti “that six inmates convicted of crimes committed at Attica be granted pardons.” Carey’s actions included clemency for the two other inmates convicted of Attica-related crimes who will be pardoned, and the Attica-related sentence of the other will be commuted, making him eligible for parole.

The governor said that “Attica lurches as a dark shadow over our system of justice.” After reading, reviewing, and analyzing the materials on the Attica revolt, Carey concluded that “the conduct of this investigation and prosecution has been such that we now confront the real possibility that the law itself may fail into disrespect.”

Carey pointed out that “two independent investigators have documented the one-sided nature of the prosecution.” In the early and vigilant action to insure a vigorous, thorough, and impartial investigation and conviction of all crimes committed . . . renders futile any further attempts to secure even a semblance of equal treatment in the system of justice.

A semblance of equal justice was certainly not secured in past court proceedings. That one guard or state trooper was indicted in the slaughter of 43 Black prison victims was “a Kafka nightmare,” according to defense lawyer John Klaif, who represented many of the prisoners.

In June 1976 the California Supreme Court ordered the Los Angeles school district to take steps to desegregate its schools. The court noted that the district had failed to undertake “any efforts to alleviate segregation.”

Los Angeles has one of the most segregated school systems in the country. The Los Angeles Times reported last spring that 292 of the city’s 1,600 public schools have more than 50 percent minority enrollment. Of those 292 schools, 157 have 97 percent or higher minority enrollment.

In the four years that Los Angeles has had a Black mayor, the schools have become more—not less—segregated, while continuing to deteriorate.

State Senator Alan Robbins has joined the race for mayor as an antibusing candidate. Robbins represents the San Fernando Valley area, where racial whites have organized an antibusing group named Bustop.

Promoting his candidacy, Robbins told the Los Angeles Times that “forced busing is going to bring racial disunity to the community, and what the city has needed over the last two or three years is a more than a candidate who can lead the city forward.”

Robbins also plans to run a “law and order” campaign against incumbent Bradley. “Law and order” is a small “rape whistle” that he is handing out by the thousands.

Rockefeller could have ended the rebellion peacefully and humanely by granting the prisoners’ just demands. He refused. Instead of meeting with the prisoners, he met with President Richard Nixon. The result was the shoot-to-kill order that ended in more than forty deaths.

Carey has no plans to right this wrong. His December 30 statement made it clear that no action will be taken against “any armed personnel who were misdirected or abused their authority in the retaking of the facility.”

This will only continue the whitewash of the state’s actions in the Attica massacre.

Carey’s decision recognizes at long last that the victims at Attica were victimized. That’s good! But the evenhanded justice that Carey promised will not be had until a full investigation into the massacre has been made and all those responsible for the murders—no matter how high up—they have been indicted and convicted.

Busing, cop spying key issues
Protests called to stop Utah execution

By Steve Wattenmaker

Jimmy Carter’s political “honeymoon” with one group of Americans may be over even before the inaugural confetti is swept off Pennsylvania Avenue later this month.

Militant staff writer Steve Wattenmaker is a Vietnam-era veteran. In 1974 he successfully fought an attempt to kick him out of inactive status with a less-than-honorable discharge. His membership in the Young Socialist Alliance, the army contended, was “incompatible with national security.”

Demand Carter grant unconditional amnesty

By Barry Sheppard

The socialist movement in the United States will take an important step forward on January 24, the publication date of the first issue of a biweekly magazine in Spanish.

The new publication will be called Perspectiva Mundial (World Outlook). The appearance of the magazine will mark the first time that a regular socialist publication has been produced by the Trotskyist movement in this country.

That such a publication can now be launched reflects the growth of the Socialist Workers party and Young Socialist Alliance in the past few years, especially coming out of the Trotskyist movement in this country.

The growth of the socialist movement has also been reflected in building branches of the SWP and YSA that are located in Puerto Rican, Chicano, and other Spanish-speaking communities in many cities from New York to San Francisco.

Interest in socialist ideas is on the rise among the oppressed Spanish-speaking peoples in the United States—one result of their radicalization in recent years. More Spanish-speaking people are joining the SWP and YSA as we become more deeply involved in these struggles.

Perspectiva Mundial will be an important next step toward the goal of constructing a bilingual socialist movement in this country.

Much of the material in Perspectiva Mundial will consist of translations from the revolutionary socialist newspaper, the Internationalist Press. As such, Perspectiva Mundial will have at its disposal IP’s unique resources, including worldwide correspondents, translations from the world press in more than twenty-five languages, and documents.

Accordingly, the new magazine will present international news, analysis, and information that has not been available in Spanish before. It will, in addition, contain reprints from the Spanish-language revolutionary socialist press as well as special features, including translations of articles by Leon Trotsky.

The magazine will endeavor to set the same high standards of accuracy in fact and translation that Internationalist Press maintains. In this regard, it will stand head and shoulders above attempts at printing certain columns of Spanish in the publications of other tendencies on the American left.

Such a magazine will be of interest not only in the United States. It will help build the socialist movement in Spanish-speaking countries throughout the world.

Readers of the Militant who can read Spanish are urged to use the coupon below to get your subscription now and not miss a single issue, and to bring the magazine to the attention of others who might find it useful.

And, for those who are studying Spanish, Perspectiva Mundial is a must!
Women's rights action will kick off new year

By Ginny Hildebrand

This past year government and right-wing forces have been battering women's rights. In the first month of 1977 feminists and their supporters will hold actions demanding a halt to these attacks.

Equal Rights Amendment

At a widely covered January 4 news conference, Atlanta Mayor Maynard Jackson proclaimed January 7-8 ERA weekend. That's the weekend of an Equal Rights Amendment conference at Georgia State University. The 8:00 p.m. Friday rally at GSU's Urban Life Auditorium will feature leading feminists, unionists, and Black rights activists.

Discussions and workshops on building a 1977 Georgia ratification drive will begin Saturday at 10:30 a.m. An Informational Demonstration will begin at 2:00 p.m. January 9 at the State Office Building Plaza.

An Open Air Speak-Out in Rich­mond will demand Virginia's ratifica­tion. The featured speaker at the

January 15 Monroe Park rally will be Gloria Steinem. For information on a chartered bus from the Washington, D.C., area call (703) 378-3673.

Seattle activists in the Washington Equal Rights Action will aid the drive in unratified states by holding a January 14 teach-in at the Seattle Center.

A January 14 rally in Houston at the First Unitarian Church will be dedicated to Alice Paul, author of the ERA. Among the speakers will be Elma Barrera, a local TV news reporter; Nikki Van Hightower, a feminist and advocate for the city; and Zoia Jones from the National Council of Negro Women.

The rally, which is set to start at 7:30 p.m., is sponsored by NOW, Coalition for Women's Rights, Urban Life, Employed Women, Socialists, Worker­ers' party, Breakthrough magazine, and the Texas Women's Action Committee.

Abortion

On January 14 the St. Paul Militant Labor Forum is sponsoring a panel discussion entitled In Defense of Women's Right to Choose Abortion. It will begin at 7:30 p.m. at the YWCA. Speakers will be representatives of the abortion Rights Council, St. Paul NOW, Socialist Workers party, Women's Political Caucus, and Concerned Neighbors Coalition.

Socialists blast gutting of affirmative action

Last fall the Labor Department proposed new guidelines to gut affirmative-action hiring programs.

The new government order to­hold hearings in Atlanta, Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York.

Socialists, feminist and Communist party leaders shook their heads. "This doesn't mean that America's rulers won't try to find ways to ignore the ERA or even use it against women, if ratified."

Stalinists seek 'protection' for anti-ERA line

By Ginny Hildebrand

Communist party leaders shook their heads. How, they pondered, could feminists think that the ERA would have made it tougher for the Supreme Court to rule against paid maternity leaves?

"The court ruling . . . makes clear that it fact and not just in word," the editors of the

Look at the Fourteenth Amendment. Blacks have used this antiall-at-once constitutional amend­ment in their fight for equal protection under the law. Now, however, the California Supreme Court has upheld its counterpart's amendments to that state's anti-discrimination law.

Would the CP urge Black rights supporters to organize to repeal the Fourteenth Amendment? It wouldn't dare.

But on the ERA, the CP sounds the retreat even before the battle. It declares: "This Court has clearly, through many decisions, defined itself as a pro-big business court. We would feel very uneasy about leaving such a decision [interpretation of ERA laws under the ERA in the hands of this Court]."

Who's saying we should leave the interpreta­tion of the ERA to the Supreme Court? A fighting women's and labor movement could drive through ERA ratification and make the courts enforce it according to the needs of working women. These needs include erasing some so-called women's protective laws and extending others.

The CP doesn't mention that many "protective" laws have "in fact and not just in word" discrimination against women. They have explicit­ly barred women from "men only" jobs. Others, such as weight lifting maximums that apply only to women, have locked us out of jobs.

Already, two states have substan­tially altered or repealed their "protective" laws under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Would the CP urge us to topple this civil rights law? When you get right down to it, the CP opposes the ERA for the same reasons as right-wingers: fear of its reverence for the nuclear family and traditional sex roles.

The October 25, 1975, Daily World emphasized the importance of "special laws protecting women workers including weight lifting maximums" and "overtime limits so families will not suffer.

I'd like to hear reactions to this from women working on the Alaska pipeline and working mothers who are trying to get their husbands to share family responsibilities.

The CP's hostility to the ERA stems from its mentors in the Soviet bureaucracy, who seek to bolster women's subordinate role by assigning them the main responsibility for child rearing and housekeeping—even if they have a job as well.

Note, for example, the laws that still curtail women's right to abortion. The CP's People's Court has refused to apply to women what it says the ERA gives them—and even before the battle.

Sexist attitudes in the Soviet Union reflect these government policies. For instance, one survey found only 25 percent of Soviet men approve of their wives having jobs!

The Soviet journal Literary Gazette recently reported that dozens of Moscow women, in this kind of complaint: "Every man dreams of a woman who's soft, loving, expressive, affectionate, modest and shy—a feminine woman ...."

"Their bosses shou­ld do away with their shabby way of dressing and their swagger­ing way of drinking bottom-up like a man turns the hoodie into a crude bib."

This sounds like something you'd read in Vogue magazine from its male readers complaining about the "women's lib" movement. Wouldn't we also hear this kind of lament around the editorial office of the Daily World?
After 5-day disappearing act
Infomer in Hampton case 'loses' memory

By Nancy Cole  
CHICAGO—FBI agent-provocateur William O’Neal—the key witness in the Lee Davis case—has disappeared here—is trying to turn the tables by “remembering” only what he wants to about his infiltration of the Black Panther party.  

BPP members Hampton and Clark were murdered when they tried to break Lee into the United States in December 1969 when Chicago cops shot their way into a West Side apartment. The $47.7 million lawsuit was filed by the families of the two slain Panthers and by survivors of the murder and against the governmental conspiracy by the FBI and Chicago cops in planning and carrying out the assassinations.  

As part of the FBI’s Counterintelligence operations against the Panthers, O’Neal had worked himself up to “captain of security.” He was responsible for protecting FBI leaders.  

When pressed, he permitted in court to delivering a floor plan of the murder scene. He was never convicted of having drugged Hampton the night of his death to ensure the FBI leader would not talk during the trial. He can’t “recall” if he did it.  

O’Neal had been on the witness stand for weeks when he disappeared with no explanation December 8. Governor attorneys had claimed his wife was having a nervous breakdown that he had to leave the courtroom for a month to recover. But he reassigned to the FBI. Plus he gets about $500 “expense” money each week for coming in to consult with his attorney.  

“O’Neal is still performing Counter-  

intelligence,” Haas adds. “His purpose in the trial is to try and dirty up the Panth-  

ers. The counterintelligence program was aimed at destroying the Panthers and discrediting them. And this is the function he’s trying to serve here.” And Judge Perry is more than willing to give him and the other defendants in the case a break.  

The U.S. Court of Appeals here denied permission by the plaintiffs’ attorneys that would have required the production of the entire trial transcript for the higher court’s inspection. The plaintiffs cannot afford the costly court request.  

The purpose of the appeal to a higher court, Haas explained, “was to show that first, the judge is prejudiced and second, because of this he is not the proper one to rule on a contempt motion against attorney Perry.  

Taylor was jailed by Perry for five hours November 11 over a broken water pitcher. As one example, plaintiffs submitted an affidavit from a former government attorney in the case, Sheldon Waxman, reporting a conversation he had with the judge. Perry told Waxman before the trial even began that the plaintiffs would “never be able to prove that the FBI killed those fellows.”  

When court resumed after the holi-  

day break, plaintiffs attorneys plan to ask for an order of the trial. But Perry has arbitrarily declared to be over January 15. O’Neal is expected to testify for at least two more weeks. The half the cops defendants have yet to even take the stand.

Oliver Lee Davis fights racist frame-up

By Bill Ruppert  
NEW ORLEANS—Lee Davis is a twenty-one-year-old Black man serving a ninety-nine-year prison sentence for his role in a $47.7 million lawsuit against the FBI. Davis was involved in the events surrounding the November 18, 1975 trial of organizer Fred Hampton and his brother Mark Clark.  

Before coming to Chicago, Davis was a star basketball player at Skyline High School in Dallas. That trip was to become the longest ride in Davis’s young life.  

Near Waxahachie he car stopped at a store. Unknown to Davis before, the two young men intended to rob the store. After the robbery attempt Davis, scared for his life, got back into the car and the police stopped the car and arrested everyone.  

The two young men and the store owner testified that Davis was not involved in the robbery. Despite this he was charged with robbery and held in the Ellis County jail.  

Davis was kept in a seven-man cellblock for several months. All this time he tried to resist the bigotry and racism of the jailers. Davis was Black and proud. This made his jailers hate him.  

On the day of the robbery trial in Waxahachie, Davis was found guilty and given a ten-year probation sentence. Davis’s coach was so upset by the verdict that he was heard to declare, “Life is not good enough for what you’ve done.” He later confirmed as a juror. Davis’s case is now on appeal.  

Actions defend LA antideportation activist

By Jan Aragon  
LOS ANGELES—-The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is expected to hold its ninth hearing this month in its nine-month effort to deport José Jacques Medina. Medina, an undocumented student activist movement here, was arrested by the FBI last March on a warrant dated March 17, 1977.  

Before coming to the United States, Medina was a leader of the Mexican student movement. He was active in the Defense of students just arrested “Massacre of Tlatelolco,” a demonstra- 

tion that was brutally attacked by the Mexican government.  

Because of threats and harassment by right-wing groups such as “Los Angeles Falcons”—meeting with almost total impunity—  

Medina, then a law student, fled Mexi- 

co.  

Medina continued his political activi- 


ty in Los Angeles. He has been a member of the CASA Hermanas General de Trabajadores (CASA—General Brotherhood of Workers), an antidepor- 

tation group. He writes a regular  

column in the Los Angeles CASA newspaper, Los Inventos. Medina has also lectured on the democratic rights of undocumented workers in the Uni- 

ted States.  

Medina is being represented by attorney Leonard Weinberg. Accord- 


ing to Weinberg’s office, the INS is accused of entering the United States “without inspection,” despite the fact that O’Neal testified with a warrant. This case is another example of the govern- 

ment’s stepped-up harassment of an- 

tideportation activists in the South- 

west.  

Medina filed for political asylum in the United States August 5. According to U.S. law, any noncitizen has the right to request asylum on grounds that he or she might face persecution if returned to their country of origin.  

On January 11 Medina will appear at a hearing on his asylum request. He will offer proof that he and other political refugees in Mexico do face imminent danger.  

Medina has requested that the hear- 

ings be public.  

The Committee for the Defense of José Jacques Medina has called demon- 

strations in Seattle, Chicago, New 

York, San Antonio, and Los Angeles for January 8. The committee is objecting that letters be sent to the U.S. State Department to support asylum for Medina. Petitions are also being circu-

lated.  

For further information write: Com- 

mittee for the Defense of José Jacques Medina, 1523 East Brooklyn Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90033; or phone (213) 225-1479.
By Andy Rose

The 1.4 million members of the United Steelworkers of America have a couple of new friends who are determined to save them from an awful fate. The awful fate is that steelworkers may elect insurgent Ed Sadlowski rather than administration-backed Lloyd McBride as USWA president. The self-proclaimed friends are Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, whose syndicated column appears in some 250 newspapers across the country. Evans and Novak sounded the alarm in a column last month warning that Sadlowski’s candidacy “is supported not only by respectable liberals but by the far left, which is trying to regain a foothold in the American labor movement.”

Sadlowski’s campaign, they say, “is managed by the liberal operatives, including Washington labor lawyer Joseph Rauh, who took over the mine workers. But cheering loudly from the sidelines are the Communist Party, the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, and other leftist elements resurfacing on the labor scene.”

“Mine workers may believe that they themselves—not “liberal operatives”—took over their union in 1972 when they voted out corrupt dictator Tony Boyle and started to implement some democratic reforms. But that’s another story.”

Another bureaucrat for McBride

Lloyd McBride has received backhanded support from U.S. Labor Secretary W.J. Usery, a sometime official of the Machinists union and a top labor adviser in both the Nixon and Ford administrations.

In an interview reported last month in the Chicago Daily News, Usery “strongly endorsed” the no-strike Experimental Negotiating Agreement in steel. “It’s certainly good for the nation, and I think it’s good for both sides,” Usery stated.

The no-strike deal is a crucial dividing line in the steelworkers election. The Abel-McBride forces defend it as the cornerstone of their policy of collaboration with management. Sadlowski condemns it as a violation of union principles and a sellout of the membership.

Usery’s pro-ENA statement is further evidence of the united effort by the union bureaucracy, the employers, and the government to defeat Sadlowski and keep the steelworkers union subservient to the corporations.
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Interview with Manzo defendants

Immigration counselors take on ‘la migra’

By Harry Ring

TUCSON, Ariz.—By the time they are finished, federal officials here may feel they selected the wrong victims when they indicted three social workers and a nun for the "crime" of counseling undocumented immigrants.

The four are determined to mobilize the broadest possible support to fight this frame-up. They are already making encouraging headway.

This was the definite impression I came away with after interviewing three of the four defendants here.

The Manzo Area Council is a busy community agency in the heart of Tucson’s Westside Chicano barrio.

Recently a new poster was added to others outside the agency’s storefront offices. The new one declares: “Manzo no. pavement.”

People in the community are indignant at the dirty game being played by la migra, the feared and hated U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and its Border Patrol cops.

Many Mexicans and other Latin Americans who come to this country without documents have relatives who are U.S. citizens. This can be the legal basis for their remaining in this country.

Immigration counseling helps people work their way through the maze of red tape involved in achieving resident status.

Manzo begins counseling

About a year ago, the Manzo Area Council expanded its services to include such counseling. It also provided the community with information about the legal rights of undocumented people.

La migra took a dim view of this.

Over the years, many people from the Mexican state of Sonora have migrated to Tucson, some fifty miles north of the border. Today, about 25 percent of Tucson’s population is of Mexican origin. Many of those have come without documents.

When Manzo began its counseling service, la migra responded with an aggressive campaign of community harassment.

Migra buses and trucks began cruising the community in greater numbers. Places of employment were raided.

Even churches were hit. In less than a year, about a thousand people were picked up.

Last April 9 Border Patrol cops raided the Manzo office. Armed with a federal warrant, they carted off files listing all of Manzo’s clients.

In the weeks that followed about 150 of these people were picked up and deported.

The warrant to seize the Manzo files had been issued on the basis that people were being counseled on how to illegally obtain welfare and food stamps. This false claim was soon dropped.

But the files were turned over to a grand jury anyway, and indictments were issued on felony charges of “aiding and abetting illegal immigration,” and “conspiring” to aid “illegal aliens.”

Those indicted were Margo Cowan, director of the agency; Catalina Montaño and Marguerita Ramirez, staff workers; and Sister Ann Gabriel Marcauzo, who had been assigned by her religious order to work with Manzo.

Their trial is scheduled for March 8.

They face a total of 166 years in jail, plus heavy fines.

Serious consequences

A conviction in this case could spell the end of immigration counseling. Anyone trying to help an undocumented person would be subject to the same charges.

When I visited the Manzo Area Council, it seemed like business as usual, with a steady flow of people in and out.

But Margo Cowan, Catalina Montaño, and Margie Ramirez took out time to discuss their case.

They emphasized that what is at stake is more than an injustice to them. The rights of undocumented immigrants are in danger as well.

They see the attack on Manzo as part of the current stepped-up INS campaign against undocumented people.

Since Tucson is generally regarded as a conservative community, they speculate, federal officials may have felt it would be easier to obtain a conviction here.

It may not prove so easy.

With the support of the elected community board of directors of the Manzo Area Council, the defendants are seeking to mount the kind of public support they know is necessary to win.

A number of social service agencies, recognizing their stake in the issue, have expressed support.

So has Bishop Francis Green of the Tucson area Catholic church. Other public figures have also spoken out.

The American Civil Liberties Union is seeking to return the seized Manzo files.

A number of Tucson lawyers are volunteering their services for the defense.

And the community is definitely supporting them.

‘I support Manzo’

A sign in the agency office announced that T-shirts were available for three dollars declaring, “I support Manzo.”

There was only one T-shirt on hand. “We told them up ourselves and we ran out,” Montaño explained.

How many have been sold so far, I asked.

“About a thousand.”

An attractive four-page tabloid has recently been prepared explaining the facts of the case and reprinting a Los Angeles Times editorial assailing the prosecution. Some 17,000 have already been distributed—about 12,000 locally, the rest to other parts of the country.

More are now being printed.

Almost everyone in the community, the defendants explained, has a relative, friend, or neighbor living under the threat of being scooped up by la migra.

Conditions are bad in Tucson. There is little industry here, and Chicanos are generally limited to service jobs or the tourist trade, mainly in hotels and restaurants.

For undocumented Mexican workers, the situation is even worse.

Most of them are from the rural areas of Sonora. There are few field jobs left in the Tucson area, and they don’t have skills for city jobs. The people at Manzo estimate that a third of them find work.

Low-paying jobs

For men it’s jobs like dishwashing in restaurants. They make as little as $1.35 an hour.

Women work as maids or babysitters. That can pay in the area of twenty dollars a week, about $150 a month. Very good cooks might earn as high as two dollars an hour.

The average wage for an undocumented worker in Tucson, they estimate, is around $1.60 an hour.

And, they add, there is a constant fear of deportation back to Sonora where conditions are even worse.

You can help

There are a number of things you can do to help the Manzo defendants.

Send a contribution or order “I support Manzo” T-shirts for three dollars each. Large, extra-large. This will help defray legal costs and publicity expenses.

Order and distribute bundles of the special tabloid explaining the case. (A contribution to cover printing and postage will help.)

See if you can arrange a meeting for one of the defendants in your area. These people are available for speaking engagements nationally during January and February.

Contact the Manzo Area Council, 1025 North Grande, Tucson, Arizona 85705.

Telephone: (602) 625-5278.

EMPLOYERS: You can use that as a club to really sweat them. “Do the work or else” is the way they approach it.

And they know they have la migra to back them up.

That’s why they went after Manzo when immigration counseling began.

“Before,” Cowan said, “people would be picked up and sent to jail.

They didn’t know they could talk to a lawyer, ask for a deportation hearing. When we started the program, people became aware of this.

“People started getting educated, to feel they have some rights. They can do something for themselves, not just passively go along with it.”

The indictments, Cowan said, “are part of a pattern. The government—as always—has set its sights onodega goals for the problems of the economy, for unemployment.”

“They try to make them appear like real aliens. ‘They’re hiding under your bed. They’re hiding under your bed. They’re hiding under your bed.’”

What they are trying to do, Cowan said, “is to convince the American people that people who aren’t citizens are criminals.”

The Manzo defendants are fighting to combat that reactionary notion. They are also fighting to stay out of jail.

And they need your support.
In Our Opinion

A CARTER NEW YEAR

The New Year's resolution of the Carter administration—unofficial but self-evident—is to continue renege on the campaign promises that made millions of American voters view the Democrat as a lesser evil to Ford. The latest pledge to be "taken back" was Carter's supposed commitment to reduce war spending.

One of Harold Brown's first actions after being designated secretary of war in the new cabinet was to tell reporters he doubted that an "absolute reduction" of $30 billion to $7 billion could be made in so-called defense spending.

Carter's press secretary, Jody Powell, immediately seconded the retraction. "I don't think Carter ever intended to make or made that commitment," Powell said. Powell was lying.

* In the New Hampshire primary, Carter called for a $7 billion to $8 billion cut in the Pentagon budget.
* In June he advised the Democratic party platform committee that "without endangering the defense of our nation or our commitment to our allies, we can reduce present defense expenditures by about $5 billion to $7 billion annually."

Carter was also lying. The war budget reduction is now on the same scrap heap with Carter's pledge to make job creation the first responsibility of any president is to guarantee the health or public transportation or other vital social services. The cutbacks will go on. The unemployment will go on. The inflation—fueled by war spending—will go on.

The promise-shredding continues on other fronts as well. The promise-shredding continues on other fronts as well.

* "Feminist Reprint" Enclosed is a copy of the Feminist Reprint, published by the National Organization for Women, hot off the presses. Included in it is an article from the Militant ['What will women lose? The ERA & 'protective' legislation' by Ginny Friedland reprinted from the March 12, 1976, Militant.] This paper is intended to be a fund-raiser as well as a consciousness-raiser. It is our hope that it will succeed on both counts.

* "High school rights" I would like to inform the readers of the Militant of a thus far successful political venture in Hastings High School. More than a month ago I began the formation of the Civil Rights Club. Following all the standard procedures to bring about an official school club, the organization was rejected on the grounds that it was an illegal club.

We voted to change our name to SCORE. The acronym stands for Students Combating Organized Repression, Etc.

After numerous futile discussions with the administration, we were once again frustrated. We would not only be denied a charter, but also access to the school's paths of communication.

In flagrant disregard of policy previously passed by the board of education and pushed through by past student activists, the administration denied us the right to distribute literature and to announce meetings through the daily school bulletin.

We put up posters and tried to use the bulletin board anyway. The posters were torn down and the announcements were altered or deleted entirely.

We managed to call meetings in spite of the suppression. The turnouts were good, and we almost appealed to the principal's authority. We did not have to. He was hard to crumble, but we reached a compromise by reducing him to bargaining (a situation the administration did not want to find itself in).

In exchange for a summary of our goals and intentions, the principal will in a written paper admit that he was discriminatory in dealing with our club. It is a small victory but victory just the same... and it is a start. Andrew Ratkin

Hastings-on-Hudson, New York

Letters

Paid maternity leaves

One element of the recent Supreme Court ruling on paid maternity leaves not taken up in the Militant's insightful and angry analysis is that whether it was given as the foundation of the ruling by local media: that pregnancy is a "voluntary and desired condition" unlike heart attacks or prostate surgery.

After regainng my breath from this blindingly cynical jetted from nine white, male judges high atop Mount Patriarchy, I found that this misinterpretation is widespread among many not-quite-so-poor people.

The right to choose abortion or a safe, effective means of contraception is available, such factual-sounding statements remain bombast. It is in fact the poorest among us who have the least access to currently available methods of reproductive planning; thus, this ruling, like the Hyde amendment [a congressional attempt to ban federally funded Medicaid abortions] hit hardest at poor and minority women.

The "ignorance" behind such a statement is the same sentiment that keeps all oppressed people in our varied chairs.

Sara Smith
Washington, D.C.

High school rights

I just recently read Peter Seidman's review of The Front (Militant, December 17). I feel his approval of the film is totally contradictory to the values of the left.

The Front is just another long overdue, schmaltzy, cliché ridden, Hollywood film. It still adheres to outdated and "unrevolutionary" cinematic clichés. Liberal Hollywood continues to dodge real issues and waters everything into cheap humanistic values.

Political thought is complex. Marx himself was extremely critical of anti-intellectual and emotional (idealist) political thought. It makes no sense to talk about if The Front is pro-left or not, to me it is just a mishmash of "politically safe humanism."

Of course the film is meant to be entertaining, but here is the contradiction, Mr. Seidman. How else can the entertainment industry thrive except under the values and economics of a capitalist society. Let's not resort to platitudes, let's resort to critical thought.

Tim Smith
Seattle, Washington

Carter and Artis

New Jersey Prosecutor Burrell Humphreys, the man who orchestrated the second frame-up of Rubin Carter and John Artis, is boasting that a gain been made for civil liberties and civil rights. He is expected to do the same time. Blacks on the jury voted for conviction, which he says is an advance for racial harmony and safer streets.

Never mind that the trial was a farce and a fraud. Humphreys got his conviction mainly through the testimony of Alfred Bell, a meek character, self-confessed liar, and short-time crook who has been coddled by the New Jersey cops for the last ten years, stating off and on that he saw...
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Brazil ‘Contingency Plan’

The publication of previously secret diplomatic communications has revealed the U.S. government’s complicity in the rightist coup that installed a repressive military regime in Brazil nearly thirteen years ago. Previously, U.S. officials sanctimoniously denied any involvement in Latin America.

The December 29, 1976, Washington Post reported, “The United States was prepared, if needed, to support militarily the Brazilian armed forces’ ouster of the country’s last civilian government. . . .”

“A U.S. naval task force with an aircraft carrier, a helicopter carrier, six destroyers and oil tankers was ordered to take positions off the Brazilian coast during the 1964 coup.”

According to a top secret telegraphic communication delivered to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, the U.S. ambassador to Brazil, Lincoln Gordon, was authorized to determine “whether Brazilian military forces or state police forces will require early U.S. support.”

As was the case later in Chile and Argentina, the military take-over in Brazil was preceded by a period of mass radicalization. Millions of workers were organized into powerful trade unions. Inspired by the Cuban revolution, tens of thousands of peasants in the Northeast had organized into peasant leagues demanding redistribution of the land. A constitutionally elected government led by João Goulart was elected to assuage popular sentiment by instituting modest reforms.

The breadth of the mass upsurge was immense. The demands of the rank and file soldiers began to demonstrate for their right to organize and in support of land reform and other democratic rights. Dean Rusk, U.S. secretary of state at the time, cynically described the coup as a “move to insure the continuity of constitutional government in South America.”

Goulart and his clients in Brazil were convinced that the popular mobilization could not be defeated. In March 1964, Brazil’s President Castello Branco was overthrown.

In the aftermath of the coup, the unions and the movement for democratic rights were banned. Thousands of Communist party members, socialists, and other radicals were arrested and many were killed. Torture was institutionalized as a means of terrorizing the masses. The living standards of the workers and peasants, already intolerably low, were systematically slashed, as the U.S. imperialists and their Brazilian allies raked in unprecedented profits.

Lincoln Gordon, who later became assistant secretary of state for Latin America, attempted to belittle the revelations of U.S. involvement in the coup by stressing that “it was a contingency never put into effect.” This was true because the Brazilian masses, who had placed confidence in Goulart and were caught off guard by the coup, were unable to put down effective resistance.

However, a very similar contingency plan was put into effect by Washington a little more than a year later, when the dictator of the Dominican Republic, General Elias Wessin y Wessin, proved unable to put down a rebellion by forces favoring a return to constitutional democracy. More than 20,000 U.S. troops occupied the country. The U.S. rulers—fearful that the establishment of greater democratic rights would foster worker and peasant struggles leading toward a socialist revolution—installed a new puppet regime.

The disturbing thing is, however, that the December coup December was no worse than an average month in 1976 in terms of ecological disasters. The events of the past year, in relation to the environment, show a dangerous new level of breakdowns, sickness, and destruction caused by capitalist production for profit.

In January, the French-British Concorde supersonic transport aircraft began making commercial flights. Environmentalists maintain that the Concorde will raise air and noise pollution near airports to dangerous levels, as well as damage the earth’s ozone layer. The ozone layer protects humans from the sun’s ultraviolet rays, which can cause skin cancer. In February, Washington granted the Concorde permission to land in the United States.

February also saw the resignation of three top engineers from General Electric’s nuclear energy division. “Nuclear power has become a technological monster and it is not clear who, if anyone, is in control,” stated one of them.

Various studies were released last spring pointing to air pollution and industrial chemi­cals as responsible for the spread of cancer in urinary diseases. Meanwhile, to help the capitalists achieve an economic recovery, federal and state governments have pressed for relaxation of the pitiful pollution control standards that exist.

In May, a federal grand jury charged Allied Chemical Corporation, Life Science Products, and the city of Hopewell, Virginia, with 1,096 violations of water pollution laws. After seventy-five hours of testimony and their families suffering nerve tremors, erratic eye movements, loss of memory, slurred speech, liver damage, and other ailments, they had been convicted by the deadly chemical kepone, which had been discharged into the city sewage system by the Allied Chemical plant.

While the plant itself has now been buried, Allied Chemical still has the problem of how to get rid of sixty-five tons of kepone that contaminated a site in New York.

In mid-June a specter began haunting New York City: a giant mass of sludge had reached the shore of Long Island. Seventy miles of beaches had to be shut down as the waters splashing onto them turned into a “giant toilet bowl,” as one local official called it.

The sludge invasion was the result of the forty-year practice of dumping raw sewage off the coast of New York.

On July 10 a pipe in a chemical plant exploded in Italy, releasing a cloud of poisonous gases on the town of Meda. The chemical released is one of the most toxic substances known; it had previously been used in the defoliants sprayed by U.S. planes in Vietnam. Animals died by the thousands and the area had to be evacuated. Doctors fear that those contaminated with even small doses will face long-term effects including kidney, liver, and lung damage as well as deformed children.

The consequence to the threat of environmental destruction has also mounted. On June 1, 11,000 Japanese demonstrated against the docking of the nuclear-powered merchant ship “Silica.” On May 16, in Argentina, more than 30,000 people protested at the site where an atomic energy plant is being built near the village of Brodkoff. The demand for safe conditions on the job has become a central demand of increasing numbers of trade unions.

The scope of environmental breakdowns and disasters is climbing. The power and complexity of technology that has been achieved under capitalism is turning against humanity, enveloping us with sludge, disease, floods, and the threat of nuclear holocaust. This is because of the deepening anarchy of capitalism in its monopolistic stage. As Marx predicted more than one hundred years ago, the current system of production—private ownership and private profit—comes into greater and greater conflict with the social nature of production and the interdependence of productive efforts. The system of production for profit channels society’s powerful productive forces into anarchic and antihuman directions, producing breakdowns and disorder. Human safety is sacrificed to profit.

Working people and their allies need to take control of technology and production out of the hands of the profit hogs who now control them. Democratically planned production for human needs can make this planet green and enable all human beings to enjoy the fruit of the powerful technology we have created.
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Roots of the War in Lebanon

‘The civil war in Lebanon was not fundamentally a religious conflict. Religious differences are linked to the class differences in Lebanese society, and to the issue of imperialist domination.’

By Peter Seidman

On November 15, 1976, the Syrian army completed its occupation of Beirut. Newspapers and diplomats around the world hailed this step as marking the end of the bloody civil war in Lebanon.

Cyrus Vance, secretary of state-designate, has stated that the time seems ripe for a major diplomatic move toward a negotiated peace in the Middle East. Moscow has been calling for this for a long time. President Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt favors negotiations as well.

Despite the peace talk in Washington, Moscow, and Cairo, however, the Middle East remains a flash point in the world. Tens of thousands of peasants fied to Beirut to protest this attack. The government has not initiated the policies of the big landowners, had also gone to the capital. This massive exodus from the countryside was not the result of the modernization of agriculture and the development of industry in the cities. It was forced by the backwardness of agriculture and the inability of the government to protect the peasants from Israeli attacks.

Beirut, after Tokyo, is the most densely populated city in the world.
of the wealthy ruling clique, which thrived amidst great popular misery. Here is how Eric Rouleau described this ruling elite in a September 1975 issue of Le Monde: “The privileged lead ostentatious lives: several big cars, preferably American and sometimes fitted with telephones, per family; country homes in the hills with swimming pools, tennis courts, even a golf course, all protected by a big estate to which one escapes in the hottest times of the year.

“Apartments in Paris, Geneva, London, or New York are used for short stays when on business or in search of pleasure. Yachts anchored out at Tsiklit, off Beirut, make it possible to spend pleasant weekends with friends.”

Religious War

These inequalities provided the highly combustible material which flared into the Lebanese civil war. The superficial view that the divisions in Lebanon take place along simply religious lines has led some to view the civil war as primarily of religious content.

While it is true that the reactionary forces that were fighting to maintain their privileges are predominantly Christian in composition while the leftist alliance is predominantly Muslim, the divisions in Lebanon are not most fundamental along religious lines.

The civil war impelled people to choose sides on the basis of political and social criteria; some Christian forces of leftist persuasion, as well as rightist elements among the Muslim population, broke with the predominant lines of cleavage. For example, at least two of the Palestinian refugee camps attacked by rightists were mainly Christian.

Still, religious differences have played a role in the fighting. This is because they are linked to the class differences in the country and the issue of imperialist domination.

Lebanon, like all the present-day states in the Middle East, is an artificial creation carved out of the Arab territories by the European powers. Following the breakup of the Turkish Ottoman Empire after the World War I, Britain and France played a major role—through their League of Nations mandates—in setting the stage for the crowds that today rock the Middle East.

This was not done by accident or through lack of foresight. The decay of Turkish rule and the outbreak of the First World War coincided, helping to spur forward a wave of Arab national consciousness. The Arab masses demanded political independence from Turkish and then Western imperialist rule and a united Arab nation.

Britain and France, highly conscious of the threat of the Arab nationalism in the Arab East, used their mandate power to block the Arab nationalist movement in every possible way.

One aspect of this policy was the carving out of artificial states, which were kept weak and pitted against each other. In this way the Arab national struggle against the colonialist powers was saddled with the burden of inter-Arab competition between regimes.

In Lebanon, the French exploited religious differences to try to build a base for their continued domination and to counter Arab national consciousness.

When the French were confronted with an insurgent independence movement during the Second World War, finally gave up their mandate and negotiated formal independence for Lebanon, they did so under a complicated governmental formula that granted special privileges to the Christian population—especially the Maronite sect—at the expense of the Muslims. Today, Lebanon is run by a Maronite minority.

The impact of this formula was to make it appear that the divisions within Lebanon had their origins in religious differences rather than in the special privileges granted the Maronites in exchange for their cooperation with imperialism.

The religious aspect of the civil war today is, therefore, not a sign of some inherently senseless bigotry among the Arab peoples, as some pro-Israeli spokespeople have tried to claim; it is rather another bitter legacy of imperialism’s drive to weaken the Arab revolution.

Only by seeing the underlying social relations and contradictions can the correct political conclusions be drawn.

Weakness of Lebanese Capitalism

To begin with, it must be noted that the Lebanese government presides over a weak capitalist state. Lebanon’s warped economy is a result of the exploitation of the country by imperialism, both through the bequest of Turkish and French colonialism, as well as through the present role of U.S. imperialist domination.

The country’s economy is also weakened by the constant military incursions of Israel, the imperialist outpost to the south.

The Lebanese capitalist class, however, is unwilling and unable to take the steps necessary to develop the country, even along capitalist lines. To do this, they would have to challenge imperialist control of investment, which has kept the economy backward, as well as the grip of the reactionary landowners on agriculture. A thoroughgoing land reform would be necessary to increase agricultural productivity, thereby building a base for stepped-up industrialization.

Moreover, the Lebanese capitalists would have to be prepared to stand up to economic reprisals that would be imposed by the imperialist powers to try to crush any threat to their profiteering in Lebanon.

Such anti-imperialist moves could only be sustained if the Lebanese capitalists were willing to bear the burden of the masses to defend these measures. And such a mobilization would carry with it the threat of direct imperialist military intervention.

The experience of the self-determination struggle of the Vietnamese and Cuban peoples amply demonstrates this pattern. But the Lebanese capitalists have shown no willingness to break with their imperialist patrons and stand with the masses against them.

The Lebanese rulers fear such mass mobilizations even as they sometimes need to make use of them. For action by the masses will tend to go beyond the narrow limits of the system of capitalist property relations that is vital to the privileges and rule of the Christian rightists.

The civil war demonstrated the weakness of the Lebanese capitalist class. Against the mobilizations of the workers and peasants demanding government action to stop Israeli raids, the rightists chose to launch a violent counterattack.

Even when it came to defending their own country from Israeli bombs, the rightists saw a greater threat from the Lebanese masses and turned upon them instead.

This is because in the long run, the rightists’ goal is the defense of privilege and of capitalist property relations; in this framework, their reactionary stance in the civil war is entirely logical.

Of course, when the capitalist rulers of a semicolonial country like Lebanon do take steps to defend their country from Israeli or U.S. attacks, they deserve support as against the imperialist powers. But the war in Lebanon has highlighted the inability of the Lebanese regime—or for that matter of the Egyptian or other Arab governments—to effectively and consistently fight in their own defense.

This fact has implications for the struggle of the masses in Lebanon. Clearly the government has failed to meet the demands of the workers and peasants for land reform; for rationalization (which must mean nationalization) of the economy toward production geared to the needs of the majority; for an end to special privileges for the Christian minority; for destruction of the threat of Israeli intervention; and for genuine independence from imperialism.

But just as clearly, these things cannot be achieved under capitalist auspices. A struggle is necessary to replace a government whose loyalty is to the capitalist system, with one whose loyalty is to the interests of the workers and peasants.

This is the logic of the fight for genuine independence and land reform in Lebanon and the other countries of the Arab East. Their struggles for democratic demands must grow over into the struggle for socialist revolution.

The Palestinians

The Lebanese civil war was made all the more explosive because it was intertwined with the struggle of the Palestinian people to regain their
homeland in the territory now occupied by Israel. The expulsion of 760,000 Palestinians from their homeland in 1948 was a special form of imperialist oppression in the Middle East. All the other Arab states were created as artificially divided capitalist entities designed to preserve imperialist exploitation under conditions of formal independence. But the fate of the Palestinians was different. They were physically driven from their land by a settler-colonialist movement, Zionism, with the backing of British and then American imperialism. For years after the Arab-Israeli war of 1948, even the existence of a distinct Palestinian nation was denied by supporters of Israel. The driving of the Palestinians into wretched refugee camps was treated as an incidental and unimportant by-product of the biblically mandated return of the Jewish people to their own state in Palestine. This reactionary myth was shattered by the reemergence of the Palestinians as an independent political force after the 1967 war. The rise of the Palestinian national liberation struggle revealed more clearly the nature of Israel as a barrier to genuine Arab national self-determination. No longer depending for a voice on the Arab regimes—who had shown again and again their fear of confronting Israel in defense of the Palestinians' rights—the Palestinians reentered the arena of world politics in their own right. The new dismantling of the Zionist state that had driven them off their land and denied them their most basic rights, while giving away their privileges to the Jewish population. They proposed to create instead a democratic, secular Palestine, where Muslims, Christians, and Jews could live as equals. The emergence of the Palestinian struggle accentuated the political problems of all the Arab regimes, because it exposed their unwillingness to change the 'Palestinians' just cause—a cause that burned in the heart of the Arab masses as the most obvious symbol of how imperialism had oppressed them and blocked their economic and social progress. The rise of the Palestinian movement thus gave impetus to the formation of numerous currents opposing the Arab regimes from the left.

The potential power of the Palestinians to challenge the hypocrisy of the Arab regimes is clear from their large numbers throughout the Arab world. There are 300,000 to 400,000 Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. They compose more than one third of the population of that part of Jordan that is not occupied by Israel. Two hundred seventy thousand Palestinians live in Kuwait, a quarter of the population. Since the outbreak of the Lebanese civil war, some 150,000 Palestinians have entered Syria. And, of course, the 500,000 Palestinians inside Israel's pre-1967 boundaries plus the 1.1 million more in the occupied territories have also demonstrated their power. And not only are the Palestinians numerically significant; they also tend to play important roles in the economies and governments of the countries they live in. An additional factor is the tremendous reserves of solidarity enjoyed by the Palestinians among the oppressed masses of the other Arab peoples. The Palestinian struggle confronts and exposes the unwillingness of the Arab regimes to challenge Israeli occupation of Palestine or to defend the Palestinians from attacks by Israeli forces—such as the failure of the Lebanese government to take action against Zionist attacks on Palestinian refugees and waging war against the PLO in challenging the Israeli occupation of the Sinai. The Palestinian struggle is also objectively linked to the struggles of the Arab workers and peasants against their own governments. In both cases, the logic of these struggles is to challenge capitalist rule. It is for this reason that the Palestinian struggle against Zionism has become the spearhead of the Arab revolution against capitalism and imperialism.

And conversely, the Palestinian struggle fortifies and exposes the convergence of interests between the bourgeois Arab regimes and Israel in suppressing any challenge to capitalist rule in the region. In the case of Lebanon, the Palestinians—unprotected by the government in the face of terrorist Zionist attacks and, at the same time, hounded by government repressive forces for their independent initiatives in self-defense—found a powerful ally in the unfolding struggles of the Lebanese masses against the reactionary policies of their government. This added a particularly explosive character to the Lebanese civil war: the combined struggle of the Lebanese masses and the Palestinians pointed the way toward struggle for both socialism in Lebanon and the Palestinian goal of a democratic, secular Palestine to replace the Zionist regime.

Syrian Invasion

This is the framework in which Syria intervened in the Lebanese civil war. Syrian President Hafiz al-Assad's initial objective in Lebanon was to play off the Palestinian movement and the rightist forces against each other by providing the Palestinians with only limited support. He hoped that by striking a balance between the contending forces he would emerge as the arbiter. He hoped to force the Palestinian side to make compromises. But he wanted to do this from the vantage point of appearing to be aiding the Palestinians so as to improve his image before the masses.

Assad hoped this maneuver would allow him to increase pressure on Egyptian President Anwar el-Sadat as well. Sadat's unilateral decision to sign the Sinai disengagement pact in the fall of 1975—a pact that removed any military presence from Israel's southern front—had weakened Syria's ability to negotiate with Tel Aviv over Israel's occupation of the Sinai Heights.

Assad attacked the Sinai pacts as a betrayal of the Palestinian struggle. Since Assad's plans were no less accommodationist with Israel than those of his Egyptian counterpart, this posturing was demagogic. But it reflected the necessity of the Arab bourgeoisie nationalistic regimes to try to maintain power by doing a balancing act between the masses and imperialism. In this case, Assad's tactical moves permitted a limited backing of the Palestinian-leftist alliance in Lebanon.

However, this same balancing act required that the Palestinians and leftists not be too successful against the Christian rightists. Too much success would upset Assad's plans—which were not based on mobilizing the masses in an unrelenting struggle, but on a schema of deliberately assembled diplomatic blocs and temporary alliances safely contained within the framework of capitalism.

Assad feared the effect of mounting victories for the Palestinians and leftists. And as the Palestinian-leftist forces conquered more and more territory and threatened to defeat the rightist forces—an outcome that appeared likely by spring of 1976—the Syrian president shifted gears.

He knew that a leftist-Palestinian victory in Lebanon would be the danger of Israeli or even U.S. intervention. This in turn would open the possibility, not only within Lebanon but throughout the Arab world, for a defensive mobilization that might in the end sweep aside the foot-dragging Arab regimes. Such a confrontation would have forced Assad, along with other Arab leaders, to fight. But he had no taste for a confrontation with imperialism.

Moreover, Assad feared the inspiring influence that a leftist victory would have on the class struggle in his own country.

In face of all this, Assad cut off assistance to the Palestinians and in June launched a full-scale invasion of Lebanon aimed at driving back the leftist alliance from its newly won positions and shifting the balance of the civil war in favor of the Christian rightists.

Assad's deep fear of the Arab revolution had led him into an alliance with Israel and the Lebanese rightists against the very Palestinian cause he had been claiming to champion only months before.

Carrot and Stick

Assad maintained the same objective—to gain control over the Palestinians and use them as a bargaining chip in his own diplomatic intrigues—but his methods changed. His invasion represented a calculated decision to smash the Palestinians as an independent political force.

Given the massive support enjoyed by the Palestinians throughout the Arab world, he had no reason to move carefully. At each stage of his war drive, which finally brought him to the leftist stronghold of West Beirut in November, he advanced a step at a time, carefully measuring the response among the various camps that were party to the war: How would Israel respond? What were the signals from Washington? How strong were the other Arab regimes? What was the reaction among the other Arab regimes?

Most of the other Arab regimes gave tacit
Weaken their position.

This explains Israel's decision to appear to sit quietly by during Assad's invasion of Lebanon. The Zionists have in the past said that a Syrian presence in Lebanon would be a pretext for them to attack.

Their reason for not doing so was stated bluntly by Israeli Premier Yitzhak Rabin, who explained to a student gathering June 2, 1976, that he would "not stand in the way of anyone who wants to subdue Assad's terroristic regime.

Asad and the other bourgeois Arab leaders hope that Israel will grant concessions to them in exchange for their cooperation in weakening the Palestinians. What they hope for is the return of territory conquered by Israel in Egypt, Jordan, and Syria. They swear this is not an offer to also grant diplomatic recognition to Israel as part of such a deal.

This is the reasoning behind the sudden escalation of peace talk proposals that are now coming out of the Middle East. In fact, the Arab governments are also putting immense pressure on the greatly weakened Palestinian movement to give up their goal of a democratic, secular Palestine and recognize the right of the Zionist state of Israel to exist on the land it stole from the Palestinians.

The Arab governments are offering the Palestinians the promise that if they go along with such a deal they will be granted a "mini-state" on some part of the territory now occupied by Israel on the West Bank of the Jordan River and in the Gaza Strip.

One Palestinian leader, quoted in the October 13 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, expressed the opinion that Asad's maneuvering may even be based on assurances of such a deal from Henry Kissinger.

But the Palestinians went on to explain that the flaw in the plan is that the Israelis will give up nothing of the West Bank. All this effort of the Arabs is a buy-time...during which Israeli settlements increase on the West Bank.

Since Yasser Arafat has been able to witness with pleasure the sharp blows being directed against the Palestinians by their former Syrian ally, this no doubt comes as a welcome relief to Israel's rulers.

The Zionist regime has been more and more isolated because of its repressive and discriminatory policies toward the Palestinians. This was reflected in the United Nations resolution of November 29, 1967, condemning Zionism as a form of racism, as well as in the widespread sympathy evoked for the Palestinians in Israel who have been launching against the racist land policies and occupation tactics of the regime.

Israel feels Asad's anti-Palestinian drive for what it is—a blow directed against the Arab revolution. The Zionists have even colored the talks with the Lebanese rightists, thereby helping Asad's military offensive.

This is because the Zionists know that the defeat of the Palestinian movement in Lebanon will not only weaken the defense of that country but weaken Syria as well. A defeated PLO, Lebanon, obtained at the expense of the major obstacle to Israeli military operations in southern Lebanon and on the approaches to Damascus.

West Bank Palestinian State?

As theertz toward the Lebanon events hardly promises any motion in the direction of granting a settlement that would reflect some form of truncated Palestinian homeland. The Israeli ruling class is not interested in a settlement, but in the maintenance of their regime, the very logic of which is expansionist.

The whole history of Israel is marked by military incursions against its Arab neighbors. The latest proof of the Israeli government's intentions is its stepped-up military and economic assistance to Lebanon. Israel's army has long considered the Litani River in southern Lebanon a more "natural" boundary. With the weakening of the Palestinian movement, the Israelis moved in to the Litani area, the Zionists may now feel able to try to secure it.

The Zionists are aware that the convergence of interests they now share with Asad will not last forever.

As long as Syria can maintain the status quo in Lebanon, obtained at the expense of the Palestinians, Israel is likely to leave Asad's maneuvers unchallenged. But a number of factors threaten the cease-fire in Lebanon.

One is the different approaches to the Palestinians held by Asad and his present allies, the Christian rightists. Asad wants to break the Palestinians politically, but the Lebanon rightists want to go further than the Syrian president in curbing Palestinian activities.

Asad—under pressure from the pro-Palestinian sentiment of the masses in Syria—might feel he would have to turn against his rightist allies of today should they decide to launch a new offensive against the Palestinians.

Another time bomb built into the cease-fire is the call for disarming both sides in the civil war. So far this has not happened. The rightists say they will not disarm until the Palestinians have been disarmed.

There are conflicting reports as to what the Palestinians will do in the face of this ultimatum. Israel will be watching Asad's reaction to this disarmament process carefully, especially since it is linked to another part of the cease-fire agreement that calls for the return of the Palestinian guerrillas to their bases in southern Lebanon. This is an area where right-wing Christian militias have been built up and armed by the Tel Aviv as part of a conscious decision to establish an anti-Palestinian force on Israel's northern border.

Should these Christians attack the Palestinians, Asad will be confronted with the choice of risking complicity with them in an effort to further weaken the Palestinians—a step which could be highly dangerous to him on his home front—or else backing the Palestinians and thereby risking new confrontations with Israel.

The truth is that while Asad and other Arab rulers appear to be holding all the strings in this complicated balancing act, they are severely limited in their options—the one hand by the vast reserves of pro-Palestinian sentiment among the masses, and on the other by the intrusiveness of the Israeli regime. The peace pact worked out so far in Lebanon is a fragile rest of straw sitting on top of these two powerful, explosive forces.

Israel Prepares for War

And as a result it is war, and not a settlement, that the Israeli government considers the likely outcome of the Lebanon events in this situation. War is what the Israeli government is preparing for.

Lieut. Gen. Mordechai Gur, the Israeli chief of staff, was quoted in an October 4 New York Times dispatch as saying: "The quiet on Israel's northern borders with Syria and Lebanon has enabled us, the Israeli defense forces, to worry less about current security problems and concentrate more on preparing ourselves for total war.

The most sensitive conflict has enabled us to concentrate more on central matters."

What is evident from all of this is that the defeat of the Palestinians in Lebanon has only heightened the danger of war and weakened the Arab freedom struggle.

Furthermore, the war in Lebanon has demonstrated anew that none of the Arab regimes are politically reliable allies of the Palestinians in forestalling this dangerous possibility.

While some advantages can be gained by maneuvering between these regimes and exploiting their contradictions, the real allies of the Palestinians are the masses in the Arab world, whose interests lie in anticapitalist struggle against their governments.

The war in Lebanon has also demonstrated anew that Israel is no refuge for the Jewish people. The threat of war is here as the result of the Israeli occupation of Palestine. The Israeli state must be armed to the teeth and constantly on a war footing against the Arab masses. Any advantage of the class struggle in the Arab world threatens the Zionist regime.

In the long run this is no safe haven for the Jews. Israel pits them—3 million—against the more than 100 million Arabs. Already there is increasing dissatisfaction within Israel—one of the most highly taxed countries in the world—over the burden imposed by the garrison state.

Threat of Anti-Semitism

Moreover, Israel is dependent on Washington for its economic and military existence. Israeli-Zionist reliance on the United States is highly ironic. For in today's world the threat of virulent anti-Semitism outbreaks looks like the reactionary lashing-out of crisis-ridden imperialist powers like Germany in the 1930s.

Violent anti-Semitism surfaced in the United States during periods of deepening social crisis of the capitalist system. These are fostered, along with racist and anticommunist forces, as a battering ram aimed against working-class struggles to resolve the crisis through socialist revolution.

Such a crisis is on the agenda for the United States as well. As the economic and social problems here continue to deepen, we can expect a resurgence of anti-Semitism to accompany the rise of racist gangs that is already beginning to occur.

Clearly, U.S. support to Israel is not based on any humanitarian considerations. There has never been a feature of American foreign policy; for example, Washington refused entry to the Jewish refugees of Europe after World War II and after World War II. It today has warm relations with the Videla dictatorship in Argenti­na, which has fostered anti-Semitic, rightist terror squads.

Washington supports Israel because it sees the Zionists as a major bulwark against the Arab revolution.

If the Arab peoples were to break out of the straitjacket of underdeveloped backwardness, this would upset a key base of American power. It would mean an end to the superprofits extracted through American exploita­tion of Arab oil. It would mean the loss of reliable control over a key trade and transport
center of the world economy. It would mean the loss of key military positions along the borders of the Soviet Union.

Israel has proven a reliable striking force against the liberating thrust of the Arab revolution. It has played this role since its founding war in 1948. In 1966 it struck against Egypt when Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal. In 1967, 1973, and in southern Lebanon today, it has cleared the way for the Arab masses.

It serves as a launching pad for reactionary imperialist blows against the African freedom struggle—as in the case of Israeli support to the South African army's invasion of Angola. It supported the dirty war of the French in Algeria and backed the U.S. aggression in Korea and Vietnam.

For these reasons, Washington fully supports the militarily powerful Israel.

And correspondingly, Washington's posture in the Lebanon's civil war has been to quietly welcome this new attack on the Palestinians.

Role of the Kremlin

In face of this lineup of counterrevolutionary forces, the question arises: What is the role of the Soviet Union? The Kremlin has always claimed to be a staunch supporter of the Arab revolution and the struggle of the Palestinians for self-determination. But Moscow has taken no meaningful steps to curb the anti-Palestinian offensive to the Militant. He works as a house painter and is a member of International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades Local 51.
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Trofim Denisovich Lysenko, who dominated agricultural and biological sciences in the Soviet Union for more than thirty years, and who was responsible for the destruction of the work, careers, and lives of many world-famous scientists, died in the USSR on November 20, 1976.

Lysenko's theories, which belong more in the realm of pseudoscience than of science, are not taken seriously today by anyone, either inside or outside the Soviet Union. None of his once heralded "breakthroughs" are still applied in Soviet agriculture.
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Basing himself on his experience with vernalization, Lysenko began to generalize about the effects of environment on plant growth and development he has postulated concerning genetics.

When the Russian plant experimenter Ivan Michurin died in 1935, Lysenko declared himself a follower of "Michurinism" and began to denounce the believers in genetics as followers of "Mendelian-Morganism," which he claimed was "bourgeois" and "reactionary.

Lysenko died in 1942. His theories of biology were not revealed by the U.S.S.R., and his theories concerning genetics.

Mendel, the man who first postulated the existence of genes; Thomas Hunt Morgan was an American scientist who also subscribed to the theory of genes.
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Lysenko believed that the environment of a plant or animal, not genetic inheritance, was the dominant factor in its development. He also believed that inherited characteristics were not caused by any basic genetic structure and could be altered in subsequent generations by environmental influences on the present generation.

This latter part of his theory is popularly known as the inheritance of acquired characteristics.

Lysenko first came to prominence in 1929, as a result of an experiment done at his father's farm near Poltava in the Ukraine. There he developed his famous process of vernalization of grain, which was to later come to dominate Soviet agriculture.

Briefly, vernalization consisted of the treating of seeds under controlled conditions of temperature and humidity for a period of time before planting. Lysenko claimed that this could significantly reduce the growing time of the crops (thus reducing the demand for water and fertilizer) and increase yields. This became a major project for agriculture that was introduced extensively in the Soviet Union.

Lysenko is by no means certain that he will ever be able to prove the existence of genes; Thomas Hunt Morgan was an American scientist who also subscribed to the theory of genes.
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Lysenko claimed that this could significantly reduce the growing time of the crops (thus reducing the demand for water and fertilizer) and increase yields. This became a major project for agriculture that was introduced extensively in the Soviet Union.

Lysenko first came to prominence in 1929, as a result of an experiment done at his father's farm near Poltava in the Ukraine. There he developed his famous process of vernalization of grain, which was to later come to dominate Soviet agriculture.

This latter part of his theory is popularly known as the inheritance of acquired characteristics.

Lysenko is by no means certain that he will ever be able to prove the existence of genes; Thomas Hunt Morgan was an American scientist who also subscribed to the theory of genes.

Lysenko died in 1942. His theories of biology were not revealed by the U.S.S.R., and his theories concerning genetics.

Mendel, the man who first postulated the existence of genes; Thomas Hunt Morgan was an American scientist who also subscribed to the theory of genes.

Lysenko's theories of biology were not revealed by the U.S.S.R., and his theories concerning genetics.

Mendel, the man who first postulated the existence of genes; Thomas Hunt Morgan was an American scientist who also subscribed to the theory of genes.

Lysenko believed that the environment of a plant or animal, not genetic inheritance, was the dominant factor in its development. He also believed that inherited characteristics were not caused by any basic genetic structure and could be altered in subsequent generations by environmental influences on the present generation.

This latter part of his theory is popularly known as the inheritance of acquired characteristics.

Lysenko first came to prominence in 1929, as a result of an experiment done at his father's farm near Poltava in the Ukraine. There he developed his famous process of vernalization of grain, which was to later come to dominate Soviet agriculture.

Briefly, vernalization consisted of the treating of seeds under controlled conditions of temperature and humidity for a period of time before planting. Lysenko claimed that this could significantly reduce the growing time of the crops (thus reducing the demand for water and fertilizer) and increase yields. This became a major project for agriculture that was introduced extensively in the Soviet Union.

Lysenko is by no means certain that he will ever be able to prove the existence of genes; Thomas Hunt Morgan was an American scientist who also subscribed to the theory of genes.

Lysenko believed that the environment of a plant or animal, not genetic inheritance, was the dominant factor in its development. He also believed that inherited characteristics were not caused by any basic genetic structure and could be altered in subsequent generations by environmental influences on the present generation.

This latter part of his theory is popularly known as the inheritance of acquired characteristics.

Lysenko first came to prominence in 1929, as a result of an experiment done at his father's farm near Poltava in the Ukraine. There he developed his famous process of vernalization of grain, which was to later come to dominate Soviet agriculture.

Briefly, vernalization consisted of the treating of seeds under controlled conditions of temperature and humidity for a period of time before planting. Lysenko claimed that this could significantly reduce the growing time of the crops (thus reducing the demand for water and fertilizer) and increase yields. This became a major project for agriculture that was introduced extensively in the Soviet Union.

Lysenko is by no means certain that he will ever be able to prove the existence of genes; Thomas Hunt Morgan was an American scientist who also subscribed to the theory of genes.
did not base his disagreements with geneticists on scientific evidence. He was unwilling to put his theories to the test of rigorous experiment, and he drew sweeping conclusions based only on the most superficial observations.

A brief look at the process of vernalization will illustrate this point. Lysenko’s original claims for this process were based on the observation of the one planting of vernalized wheat and its comparison with yields in previous years. The scientific difficulties of drawing conclusions on the basis of such experience are enormous. For example, what other factors—such as rainfall, temperature, quality and variety of the original seed, time of sowing, attacks by insects or disease, etc.—might affect crop yields from year to year?

Lysenko made no efforts to account for such effects—if vernalized seed resulted in increased yields then vernalization was the cause. This failure to take into account all possible variables was typical of Lysenko’s method.

In another case, he presented a paper on the transformation of winter wheat into spring wheat. He based this on the observation of the descendants of a single stalk of wheat of the variety Kuznetzovka. He did not even attempt to demonstrate the purity of the strain of the transformation of winter wheat into spring wheat. He based this on the observation of the offspring for the desired characteristics—such as disease resistance, rate of maturation, quantity and quality of fruit, etc.—desirable hybrids could be obtained. The lack of scientific basis for Lysenko’s techniques resulted in disastrous consequences.

The importance question is, of course, how an unscientific charter for an unscientific method to attain the position of control and influence in Soviet science that Lysenko did. The answer to this flows from the political and social climate in the USSR at the time.

At the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s, Stalin and the developing bureaucratic caste in the Soviet Union were consolidating their grip on the first workers state. No longer was the most important motivation for political and economic endeavours the advancement of the revolution and the needs of the working class.

The principal concern of the bureaucracy was the improvement of the nation’s privileged position and the consolidation of the political monopoly that allowed it to maintain those privileges. It was not interested in scientific truth any more than it was in political truth and viewed debate in this sphere, as in all others, as potentially dangerous.

Lysenko and his followers took advantage of this development away from the original goals of the revolution for Stalin’s own purposes. They introduced the Stalinist political polemic into scientific debate, accusing geneticists of advancing “bourgeois philosophy,” of “Trotskism,” and of attempting to wreck Soviet agriculture whenever they were unable to answer the scientific arguments.

Among other techniques, Lysenko used direct lies and distortions of fact; and they made amalgams between the scientific theories and political ideas of various geneticists, for example attributing to genetics an inherently racist content because of the way in which it was distorted by the Nazis in Germany. Lysenko’s opponents refused to use the same methods of debate. They correctly pointed out that scientific questions can only be resolved by scientific criteria—by the verification of theoretical models by means of experimental and other data.

Among these opponents of Lysenkoism were internationally prominent scientists who were supporters of the revolution and of Marxism. Foremost of these was Nikolai Vavilov, who was president in 1939 of the International Genetics Congress at Edinburgh, Scotland, and had formally been head of the Soviet Union’s Leningrad Plant-Growing Institute and the Lenin All-Union Agricultural Academy.

Although Vavilov made major theoretical contributions in genetics, his most important activity was the organization of expeditions to all parts of the world to gather plant specimens for use in creating new varieties specifically designed to meet the needs of Soviet agriculture. Vavilov and his supporters understood the progress that could be made in agriculture if genetics were correctly applied. The value of genetics for plant breeding lies in the possibility of creating new varieties that combine various desirable characteristics of already existing specimens. Through crossing different types of the same species and then selecting their offspring for the desired characteristics—such as disease resistance, rate of maturation, quantity and quality of fruit, etc.—desirable hybrids could be obtained.

If the scientific differences between the geneticists and the Lysenkoists had been resolved on the basis of what would be most productive for Soviet agriculture, determined by an honest test of the results of the two methods, then the victory of Vavilov over Lysenko would have been a certainty.

But Lysenko’s mimicry of Stalin’s pseudo-Marxist rhetoric and his uncritical support to the current line of the bureaucracy ingratiated him with his peers and the officialism of the Communist party, which was at all with Stalin himself. In addition, Lysenko promised through his methods extremely rapid advances for Soviet agriculture. He introduced new wheat plant varieties in a fraction of the time that geneticists said was necessary.

This promise of quick results was suited to Stalin’s call for a fast collectivization of agriculture and rapid advances in production. Another appeal of Lysenko’s theories for Stalin was the credibility which they could give to the bureaucracy’s claim of creating a new “socialist man” overnight.

Scientists to Siberia

With the support of the party in the biological debate, Lysenko’s victory was assured. No opponents of his pseudoscience would be tolerated. Stalin, through Lysenko, applied to scientific debate the method he had perfected in crushing his Leninist opponents in the Communist party—the frame-up trial of those who could not be defeated in open debate. Vavilov was arrested in 1940. He died in prison in Siberia.

Other biologists were also arrested and charged with anti-Soviet activities for the sole “crime” of believing in the validity of genetics. Some who perished were the biologists Karpechenko, Levitsky, and Govorov. Still others spent years in Stalin’s prisons or in Siberian exile.

The Lysenko phenomenon did not represent a Marxist approach to science, as many who wanted to discredit socialism and the Russian revolution maintained. It was a distortion of science made possible only by the Stalinist degeneration of the USSR. Lysenko’s opponents brought their appeals to philosophy in reality appeals to the delusions of grandeur of the bureaucratic elite. Stalin imagined that he could decide the laws of nature the same way he issued laws for Soviet citizens.

The basis for Lysenkoism, however, cannot be found in Stalin’s ideas or theories. It is rooted in the material needs of the bureaucracy in the USSR to defend their precarious privileged position against all opposition; most of all against the Soros and the Russian revolution maintained. It was a distortion of science made possible only by the Stalinist degeneration of the USSR. Lysenko’s opponents brought their appeals to philosophy in reality appeals to the delusions of grandeur of the bureaucratic elite. Stalin imagined that he could decide the laws of nature the same way he issued laws for Soviet citizens.
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from being conformists to the ruling bureaucracy.

The fundamental goals of Marxist philosophy are to broaden and expand our knowledge of and control over the material world, and this corresponds with the goal of an ever broader and more inquisitive pursuit of scientific knowledge.

**Contradiction Facing Bureaucrats**

But here the bureaucracy finds itself in a severe contradiction, as the final outcome of the Luxemburg affair reveals. In order to maintain a relatively sustained level of economic progress, the bureaucracy must apply the real advances in science and technology. Such economic progress is needed if the bureaucracy is to protect its own base from military or economic incursions by imperialism or to grant concessions to ward off the discontent of the masses.

Real advances in science and technology can only come from free and open discussion and testing of different theories. The more advanced and complex the economy becomes, the more disastrous will be the blunders resulting from the making of scientific decisions by untrained bureaucrats. It was the disastrous results of Lysenkoism on Soviet agriculture which forced a change in the Soviet attitude toward genetics and biology.

After the fall of Khrushchev, the new leadership found it necessary to end Lysenko's dominance and rehabilitate those biologists who supported genetic theory. They were forced to allow a freer debate about biological theory. Similar pressures had earlier resulted in the lifting of restrictions on Soviet scientists in other disciplines.

This partial liberalization is a Pandora's box for the Brezhnev regime. Discussion and debate cannot be permitted in one area of social life while it is barred from all others. It is not accidental that many Soviet scientists are outspoken dissenters from the Stalinist regime.

The bureaucracy is above all a product of the backwardness and poverty of old Russia. As the working class grows and industrialization raises the cultural level of the nation, there is less and less place for such a monstrosity. The bureaucracy will not voluntarily give up its power. But every retreat it is compelled to make strengthens the forces that will one day confront and overthrow it, instituting a regime based on socialist democracy.

Only then will science be genuinely free and at the service of the great majority of working people. Only then will it cease to serve as a prop for the power of entrenched minorities, as it does under both bourgeois and Stalinist rule.

---

**BOOKS**

**Rosa Luxemburg and the National Question**

The National Question

Selected Writings by Rosa Luxemburg


By George Breitman

In his 1967 book *Nationalism and Socialism: Marxist and Labor Theories of Nationalism to 1917*, Horace B. Davis included a summary of Rosa Luxemburg's views on the right of self-determination and his hope that eventually her most important writings on this subject would be translated into English.

This was desirable because Luxemburg was Lenin's chief adversary in the most important discussions about nationalism ever held in the Marxist movement, and while Lenin's contributions in this discussion have been available in English for many years (in his Collected Works and in various compilations), most of Luxemburg's (in Polish) could not be read and judged in the same way by those who know only English.

No one else responded to Davis's appeal, so he has done the job himself, while completing a second book of his own on nationalism covering the period from 1917 to the present (soon to be published by Monthly Review Press). Most of *The National Question* is devoted to the first five parts of a long six-part series Luxemburg wrote on "The National Question and Autonomy" in 1906-09, but it also contains two earlier articles by her (1896 and 1900) and excerpts from two later documents (1916 and 1918).

For this service we can only be grateful to Davis and the publisher. The superiority of Lenin's position was demonstrated by subsequent events more definitively than by what anyone wrote, but the present collection enables us to understand in detail the fallacies and weaknesses of Luxemburg's position, and to better appreciate Lenin's. This, in brief, is not the view today of Davis, whose introduction is more critical of Lenin and more sympathetic to Luxemburg than he was in his 1967 book. But I lack room here for a discussion of his introduction as a whole, except to say that I disagree with it on several points.

Rosa Luxemburg (1871-1919) was one of the towering figures of the Marxist movement, which has produced many remarkable people in its history of less than a century and a third. Her place among the greatest leaders was firmly established by the struggles she fought against reformism, opportunism, and social-patriotism in the German Social Democratic party and the Second International. Her contributions to Marxist theory, tactics, and strategy are still required reading for people who want to obtain a rounded conception of Marxism. (The best compilation for this purpose is *Rosa Luxemburg Speaks* (Pathfinder Press, 1970); its introduction by editor Mary-Alice Waters contains an excellent critique of Luxemburg's views on the national question, and it has appendices on Luxemburg by Lenin and Trotsky.)

---

**Self-determination utopian?**

In spite of her many contributions, Luxemburg was wrong, very wrong, on the national question. She held that the right of nations to self-determination was impossible under capitalism and unnecessary under socialism. She argued that in general there is no right of nations to self-determination, dismissing the very concept as utopian.

She was opposed to the independence of Poland (where she was born) from tsarist Russia, warning that support of this struggle by revolutionaries would lead them to support of bourgeois nationalism. Instead of independence for Poland, she advocated autonomy, as part of a Russian republic.

With few exceptions, she extended her opposition to independence to most areas of the world where national oppression was acute. And she has the unhappy distinction of having formulated the essence of the sterile dilemma—struggle for national struggle—that has plagued the Marxist movement throughout this century.
Luxemburg remained a Marxist while arguing these positions, and she presented them in the most effective and favorable light; it is no wonder that they were highly influential for the movement of her time. Not only was she a skilled polemicist but, as the present collection shows, she was also a master at defending and preserving the revolutionary character of Marxism. But everywhere she went for was abashed and contradicted by the positions she took.

Internationalism is not promoted when revolutionary abstain from or turn their backs on national struggles; on the contrary, such abstention benefits only the bourgeois nationalism of the procapitalist forces. Hating national oppression is beside the point, a mere personal whim or moral prejudice that is not central to a political program designed to mobilize the workers to end national oppression. The kind of working-class unity that is required to abolish capitalism cannot be achieved by ignoring national or racial privilege or by promising to combat the national question—thus national unity can be achieved only by combating national and racial oppression before and during the revolution. And a Marxism that failed to develop the realization to the new polemics by the emergence and dominance of modern imperialism would have been doomed to degenerate from the start.

Why did a Marxist of Luxemburg's stature make such errors? It has been suggested that the transformation of her passionate involvement in the internal struggles of the Polish movement, which continued after she left Poland as a student until her death in Germany thirty years later. The Social Democratic party of Poland and Lithuania, the Marxist organization which she helped found, was throughout its existence (1893-1918) engaged in bitter conflict with the Polish Socialist party—an increasingly opportunistic party of Archbachty Polish nationalism, independence—for hegemony among revolutionary workers in Poland and for recognition as the official section of the Second International. According to this interpretation, the heat of these disputes swept Luxemburg into erroneous positions and generalizations on the national question.

Methodological Weakness

There is probably some truth to this, but after reading The National Question I don't think it is the central part of the explanation. What struck me was a central inconsistency which was not unique with Luxemburg but was shared to some degree by the leaders of the prewar Social Democratic movement as a whole. This tendency was used to be called "fatalism." More recent writers discussing the same phenomenon use the term "ecologism" (in a broad sense, not the narrow sense in which it was used around 1900 in the Russian Social Democratic movement) or "determinism" (also in a broad sense). None of the terms is completely satisfactory. Anyhow, by "fatalism" was meant a tendency toward passive avoidance of some difficult problems in the belief (or hope) that time, or the further development of capitalism, or evolution, or even revolution, would care of them automatically. So why worry or bother about them now?

Looking back, we can see that the most notable manifestation of this tendency was in the area of theory and practice on the kind of party needed to abolish capitalism. Very little attention was given to this problem, even by the left-wingers in the Second International (Lenin's "Social Democracy in Germany"), because it was assumed that this problem would solve itself more or less automatically as a result of the ripening of conditions. So we have the consciousness of the revolutionary workers, etc. Meanwhile, the right-wingers strengthened their hold on the part by the conversion of centrist theoreticians like Karl Kautsky, who supplied revolutionary formulas and rationalizations to cover this reality.

Luxemburg was an opponent of Kautskyan fatalism and passivity before World War I, if being on the side of some of her German disciples enabled her to detect what lay behind Kautsky's revolutionary rhetoric earlier than Lenin did. She sensed what the polémics against the German left wing, the polemics against the German left wing, he argued that the Marxist party was "a revolutionary party but not a party which makes revolutions" and that that kind of "fatalism" is a natural phenomenon whose coming can neither be hastened nor delayed" (cited by Prof. Erich Matthias in指导意见, 1968).

And yet her own thinking on the national question was definitely swayed by fatalist economism-destination. Poland was already integrated into the Russian economy so how could it be politically separate, and what was the sense of a political demand for separation that contradicted the economic trend? Socialism, which will end national oppression, was inevitable, so why fight against the trend of achieving socialism by raising demands that might divide the Polish and Russian workers and couldn't be really and fully achieved under capitalism any­how?

Other important examples of this passive-postponement tendency in Luxemburg's time were the official Socialist party position in the United States on the oppression of Blacks (your problem with political action to achieve socialism, meanwhile, all we can offer you is an invitation to support socialism and the class struggle), and the idea that indifference or hostility inside the Second International toward the strong wave of feminism in the early years of this century on the part of women in our movement but you can't really expect us to put your interests on the same level as those of the industrial workers whose historical mission is to end class rule and end male domination).

Part of Lenin's genius as a revolutionary thinker and political leader was that he did not counterpose things that are not really opposites and should not be counterposed (and it was from this side of Lenin that Trotsky learned the fertile

truth that national struggle is a form of class struggle).

Internationalism, Lenin understood, is not necessarily inconsistent with national movement; on the contrary, it is often achieved only through the struggles of national movements. He agreed with Luxemburg that there's the danger of the end of national frontiers, barriers, and divisions; but he perceived that before we can get socialist, there's the danger of the end of the revolution, and that may be possible only by supporting movements to break up the capitalist empires through the struggle of suppressed nations or the creation of new ones.

There have been two major strands of thought of the last century about the relationship of the Marxist movement in the twentieth century. One is the Leninist, the other Luxemburgist. The latter, with considerably greater strength, was the Second International before World War II but I also among the Bolsheviks, before 1917, and in the leadership of the, the international movement in its revolutionary years. It was in a minority there, but it persisted as an unacknowledged influence and "tradition," surviving into the 1930s before Stalin extirpated everything that was not completely Stalinist. Isaac Deutscher was one of the commentators who carried this influence over into the Trotskyist movement; thirty years later, he was still unable to make heads or tails out of all the positions developed.

Trotsky, who thought Lenin's work on the national question was one of his major contributions to the Marxist movement, tried to imbue the Fourth International with the Leninist spirit and the Leninist policy.

The Fourth International is more correct on nationalities than on the threat of any postponement tendency, but even it has important weaknesses in this area. For example, I do not think it has fully developed the Leninist potential of the demand Trotsky raised in 1939 for an independent Soviet Ukraine. The Soviet Union is a prisonhouse of nations if ever there was one, with the Soviet bureaucracy imposing national oppression on most of Eastern Europe as well as the other former parts of the empire. The determination for these oppressed nations is central to the political revolution against Stalinism in the Fourth International's analysis of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, but the struggle to achieve this right gets too little attention from the leadership of the Fourth International. In my opinion the explanation for this failure is a Luxemburgist underappreciation of the national question in degenerated and deformed workers states.

There is no organized tendency or movement today that considers itself Luxemburgian on the national question. But through her writings and her political attitude persist among many sectarian and ablerient groups in the radical movements that consider socialist internationalism to be part of the "national" struggle toward socialism and nationalism, even though some of them have never read Luxem­burg's books or paid much attention to the nuances of her thought. This is another reason why it is useful to have her views in English at last.

Mendel's Soviet Women, appearing in the December ISR.

I would like very much to see this article translated into Spanish; it's desperately needed.

New York

Editors: I would like to comment on Marilyn Vogt's review of William

Mandell's Soviet Women, appearing in the December ISR. I won't agree with Vogt's view that the social needs of women are not the same as the needs of the bureau­cracy (and that they won't be until the state assumes the responsi­bility for extensive child-care centers, communal eating facilities, etc.). I think Soviet Women illustrates two important and positive points.

The first is that the Soviet bureaucracy, with the power derived from the state, is not totally able to ignore the needs of women. Women were legal­ized in 1955 and are available at no cost to any woman who requests one for medical reasons. (The preponderance of women physicians in the USSR perhaps better equates to the relation­ships than we are accustomed to in the United States.) For nonmedi­cally, reasons, any woman may have an abortion if she is willing to pay for it, which according to Mandell would be about a day's wages.

This contrasts greatly with the treatment of women in the U.S. and other capitalist countries. Here, facilities performing abortions are far too few, despite the legalization of abortion, and the costs are equal to about two weeks or more of an average working woman's pay.

The other positive impression I got from reading Soviet Women was the widespread fear or repression that Soviet women about their rights and their position in society. When they realize that they can never gain true equality while shouldering legal responsibility for raising children and caring for households, a move­ment could develop in direct strug­gle with undermedic and bureau­cratic rule. (Mallen Kea

Clackamas, Oregon

Mallen Vogt Replies: I agree with some of the points raised by Mallen Kea. However, my review of Mandell's book stressed the negative character of the book because an apology for the status quo that women face in the Soviet Union deserves to be exposed.

On the question of a woman's right to abortion in the USSR, several things should be noted: Abortions are performed by the thousands of the week of pregnancy or up to the twelfth week of pregnancy, even if "medically indicated." It is free only when "medically indicated." A woman who aborts is not held responsible for abortion ranks in importance and seriousness with voluntary dental work, excluding a woman from paid sick leave.

Thus, abortion is not considered a
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Black Music, White Racism

Mister Jelly Roll
The Fortunes of Jelly Roll Morton, New Orleans Creole and 'Inventor of Jazz'

Really the Blues

Bessie

Bird Lives!
The High Life and Hard Times of Charlie (Yardbird) Parker

By Michael Smith

There are a few good books written about jazz. But few people know about them. Like the social history of Afro-American people, their musical history is neglected. "Writing about jazz," writes Charlie Parker's biographer Ross Russell, "is something like playing jazz—a vocation without honor and frequently without profit in the country of its origin. The reason for this state of affairs is that jazz is a black art. This is no oversimplification."

The literature, scantly, is nonetheless rich, as readers of any of these books will discover to their delight.

Jelly Roll Morton, the first and most influential composer of jazz, sporting house "professor," banjo player, pool shark, singer, and gambler, related the story of "the very early days" to Alan Lomax of the Library of Congress in 1938. Jelly Roll tells how jazz came to be created in New Orleans around the turn of this century. It came forth as the result of conflict, then collaboration, between the light-skinned, French-speaking, French-cultured Creoles and the darker class of Afro-Americans, who were even more discriminated against.

The New Orleans Creoles, being part French, had some association with European music. At least they were taught the traditional ways of playing instruments. This was not true for the Black musicians, most of whom went out and bought "an axe" secondhand and took it home and taught themselves how to play through trial and error. They learned later, if at all, how to finger the notes and how to read music. Johnny Dodds, who was regarded as the finest clarinet player of his time, changed notes with his lips as well as with his fingers—the way his African predecessors would have played, say, a conch shell or a hand-carved flute. This Creole origin is what makes jazz so unique and—with little thanks due to the prevailing establishment culture—so American.

Jelly understood this, indeed he explained it to Lomax. Yet he had the typical New Orleans Creole attitude of denying he was Black and being prejudiced against those blacker than himself.

Jelly Roll (born Ferdinand La Menthe) started out playing the proverbial "piano in a whore house." It was in the red-light district, called simply the District, where jazz was developed.

What a pleasure it must have been for Lomax when Jelly, leaving his Lincoln at the curb, stalked into the stuffy Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., conservatively but splendidly dressed and sporting a diamond, set in gold in a front incisor, that "glittered like a gaslight."

Lomax writes: "Jelly Roll was on fire with his story—not of a great city and of one of those rare moments in human time when something genuinely new begins. New Orleans is, thus far, America's Florence, her Paris, the place that gave rise to the most original thing America has contributed to the arts of mankind."

Jelly immodestly told Lomax that "I, personally, originated jazz in New Orleans in 1902." Then for a period of months he sat at the grand piano in the empty chamber-music room of the library talking in wonderful prose ("Mister Jelly Lord/He's simply royal on the old keyboard," he would say) and simultaneously playing his story: and the story of his people into a dutiful tape recorder. Some took offense at his bragadocio, but none challenged his memory.

At the end of World War I the mayor, under pressure from the navy, closed down the District. That, and the shift of commerce from the river city of New Orleans north to the great railroad

Michael Smith is a member of the Socialist Workers party and works as an attorney in New York City.

...
hub of Chicago, signaled a shift in the focus of jazz. Jazzmen went up the river on fabulous riverboats undergirding new American music to the cities on its banks.

In five years after the war, a half million Blacks went North, 50,000 of them to Chicago’s South Side. And jazzmen caught the Northbound Illinois Central train. “From that moment,” writes Matty Matlock, “White jazz and Negro jazz were of one, just as the two races lived together. The music was the outgrowth of the whole African-American society.”

The biggest market for their records was among rural Blacks who made their way to the cities on its banks. “The Chicagoans, as they have become known, started playing in Chicago in the 1930s. The Chicagoans, as they have become known, learned the band business fast. Their music, Mezzrow writes, was “still a white-man’s conception, a mixture of New Orleans, ragtime, and white jazz.”

Mezzrow did not regard their music as real jazz and advised that “if you want to play real jazz, go live close to the Negro, see through his eyes, laugh and cry with him, soak up his spirit .... if you’re humble enough, and strip off your clothes.”

Mezzrow was an exception. When Hugues Panassie, the French jazz enthusiast, author, and record producer, came from Paris to New York in 1941 to study black music in 1938, he looked up Mezz Mezzrow, who true to himself was living in Harlem.

On Panassie’s request Mezz gathered together his friends—some of the great New Orleans musicians, then unappreciated and scattered around the world—and collected them at his home and wrote some of the arrangements for what was recognized as historic recordings.

Bessie sang of love, sex, and misery. As Chris Albertson, her biographer, wrote, she “raised the most powerful, soulful voice ... ever heard.”

Bessie Smith was known as the Empress of the Blues. Albertson, like Russell and Lomax, is a new breed of writers whose concern is social as well as musical. “Bessie, he writes, “had to be more than the story of the world’s most famous blues singer; it had to be the story of a woman who was black and poor long before that became the acceptable thing to be.”

Bessie was the top Black singer of her time, often making one to two thousand dollars a week. She was known throughout the world and her grave remained unmarked for thirty-three years. (Finally Janis Joplin helped pay for a tombstone, two months before she herself died.)

The most attention Bessie ever got in the white press was her obituary. Advertising and distribution of “race records” was such that Northern whites didn’t run across them. But Southerners did. They liked the blues, listened to her records, and came to her shows. Bessie did one show for white folk and the same show, either earlier or later, depending upon the local curfew laws, for Black folk. Albertson wrote, “It was only in the South that Bessie had a substantial following of whites, but their enthusiasm was reserved for her artistry.”

The only way Bessie got into white homes was on records and radio. And she played a white theater in the South only once. In the North she also only played Black theaters, not being considered “sophisticated” enough for white audiences. “Bessie wasn’t fooled by those Southern crackers smiling at her,” said her friend Ruby Walker. “She wasn’t scared of any of those white people down there. Not Bessie—she would tell anybody to kiss her ass. Nobody messed with Bessie, black or white, it didn’t make no difference.”

Charlie Parker’s life is both terrible and inspiring. In the 1950s while still a teen-ager Parker, disregarding Bach’s system of harmony, taught himself a new music on a saxophone held on the highway while driving to Clarksdale, Mississippi. He made the sax into the most expressive of instruments. His influence as an innovator exceeded that of Louis Armstrong. He made jazz a music to seriously listen to as well as to dance to. As Russell Procope, forty-year veteran of the Duke Ellington Orchestra puts it, “A Bird comes along once in a century.”

Although Charlie was uncompromisingly self-disciplined about his music, his personal life was disorganized. The huge amounts of alcohol and heroin he consumed added to his legend. “Charlie saw no future for the music he played nor for his race in America,” Russell wrote.

Just as they were later to do to Billie Holiday, New York City revoked Charlie’s cabaret license because they suspected him of drug use. He couldn’t work in New York and was forced to get on the road just as he was trying to get his life together with his new wife and child. One child died, possibly for lack of proper medical care.

The hipsters of the World War II generation were rebels. “The leading figures of jazz looked to Parker for social and political orientation,” but Parker’s protests were incoherent. Russell understood: “Because he was ahead of his time, he bore the burdens of loneliness and frustration. The frustration caused by the establishment did much to encourage his dependence upon heroin and alcohol, adding to his loneliness and making it easier toward self-destruction.” Hampton Hawes, an admirer of Parker, wrote, “Bird felt deeply about the injustice in this country. A musician I met who understood what was happening to his people. He couldn’t come up with an answer. So he stayed high.”

While these fascinating sagas about Bessie, Jelly Roll, Mezz, and Bird have not had wide circulation, one imagines that they have been read with great appreciation. And one is obliged to remember that they are but superb program notes for their subjects’ music.

Bessie had her arm torn off in a car accident on the highway while driving to Clarksdale, Mississippi. She died from not having received the prompt medical attention she would have had had she been white. Jelly died poor, the undertaker having secretly taken the diamond from his tooth. Charlie from his job watching TV on a friend’s couch. The doctor came and said the body looked to be that of a fifty-year-old sixty-year-old man. He was forty-four. He had been a drug addict for nineteen years. Mezz went to live and play in Paris, where he died. Charlie never returned to the land of his birth, but two of his children, young musicians, are growing up there. And as jazz promoter Billy Taylor has pointed out, a congressional committee to allocate one nickel for the aid of jazz during our country’s 200th birthday celebration.
Carter and Artsi at the scene of the crime. (Bello was committing a burglary at a nearby factory at the time.)

All of Humphreys’s other three key witnesses were exposed by the defense as favor-seeking police hangers-on, including one person who didn’t testify at the first trial but came forward ten years later to “identify” evidence the police had planted in Carter’s car.

The trial, as Carter has stated, was a rerun of the first. In the first trial the prosecutor was allowed to present a “motive” to the jury—that the killing of the white strangers was a act of racial revenge, a charge which is at the same time unprovable and irrefutable. This was done to protect the two men. Artsi will be eligible for parole in 1980, Carter in 1996. Readers of the Militant will continue to tell the truth about this case, and we say to Rubin and John: Brothers, if we have anything to say about it—and we will—you are not going to have to wait that long. For as the Black nationalist movement grows and seeks allies, we’ll give Humphreys and his ilk a real taste of “racial harmony.”

Michael Smith
New York, New York

S.W.P.

On October 29, 1976, my son was born. After years of subscribing to the Militant William Pooles was in time to tell our closest friends how we were voting—the initials of our son! Bill Poole, Jr.

Lake Hiawatha, New Jersey

‘Chile si, junta no’

About seventy-five people participated in a picket December 15 protesting the planned Minnesota visit of Manuel Trucco, ambassador to the United States from Chile.

The protest was called by the Minnesota Committee for Chilean Freedom and cosponsored by the United States Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLAL).

Trucco was to speak at a rally organized by People International, at the threat of a confrontation with the picket line led to the cancellation of the visit from the Chilean junta.

The protest was called by the Minnesota Committee for Chilean Freedom and cosponsored by the United States Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLAL).

Trucco was to speak at a rally organized by People International, at the threat of a confrontation with the picket line led to the cancellation of the visit from the Chilean junta.

Of special concern to the protesters is the reflection of the thousands of dollars of hospital equipment to the junta by University of Minnesota hospitals. Hospital workers, AFSCME Local 1164, passed a resolution against shipping this equipment.

Since most impoverished Chicanos have no access to hospital care, this gift at the taxpayers’ and workers’ expense will only serve to give legitimacy to the repressive military regime that rules Chile.

The letters column is an open forum for all viewpoints on subjects of general interest to our readers. Please keep your letters brief. Where necessary they will be abridged. Please indicate if you would prefer that your initials be used instead.

National Picket Line

Frank Lovell

UAW victory in Louisiana

One of the things left over from negotiations in the auto industry last year was the matter of unorganized parts plants built and operated by General Motors Corporation in the Deep South. The United Auto Workers demanded that the corporation take a hands-off policy in union organizing drives.

In negotiations with GM representatives argued that they held no animus against the UAW, and were in fact anxious to continue and extend amicable labor relations. As usual they asked only that the union “modify” its opposition to the social and economic conditions in the South, they said, dictate that newly constructed plants there should not pay hourly wages too much above the area average. The area is nonunion, as everyone knows, and the corporation was reluctant to introduce the union into communities where the general feeling was hostile.

Some salient facts were omitted from this sophisti-
cal argument. One was what the workers thought. Would they be allowed to choose union representation without fear of reprisal? In other words, if they voted for the union would they lose their jobs?

The underlying fact is that workers in these GM plants in the South are paid two dollars an hour less than is paid in Detroit for identical labor. And because the southern workers lack the job rights that are enjoyed in organized plants.

General Motors was raking in an extra profit of several million dollars a year by paying the low-wage, nonunion operations. This was one of the reasons the corporation opened these plants: the search for cheap labor. The UAW correctly called this GM’s “Southern Strategy.”

It was nothing new, not a GM invention. Other large corporations had already used this strategy with considerable success. General Electric is a vast empire of electrical manufacturing plants, many of them located in recent years in the rural South. Few of these plants are organized. The result is that the electrical unions (twelve separate unions negotiate contracts with GE) fear a strike because the corporation can continue operations and supply the market with product even while all its unorganized plants are closed.

The same is true in the rubber industry. The “big four” tire manufacturers—Goodyear, Goodrich, Uniroyal, and Firestone—all have modern plants in the South, many unorganized. One of the reasons the rubber strike dragged on for more than four months last summer was because only about 60 percent of production was closed. Officials of the auto union see in the electrical and rubber industries what can happen in a few years in auto. They challenged GM on this issue. In the end top officials of the corporation signed a memorandum that they would in no way interfere with UAW organizing efforts in six GM plants in the South.

Two days before Christmas the results of the first union election at the GM Guide Lamp Division plant in Monroe, Louisiana, were announced. The UAW won by a vote of 323 to 280. But this does not settle the matter. A contract has yet to be negotiated.

Vice-president Irving Bluestone, director of the union’s GM department, announced immediately that “UAW now will move quickly to bring the workers at the Monroe plant under the provisions of the union’s national agreement with GM and to work out local agreements that will be satisfactory to the Monroe workers.”

This sounds as if those workers had just voted themselves a substantial wage raise plus other union benefits.

If it turns out that way, the news is sure to spread. Other unorganized plants will come under union control. It may be that the way is open to organize the rubber and electrical manufacturing industries.

What happened in Monroe is a sign. It heralds big changes that have been long delayed in the South.

Sudowki has denounced the racist myth—peddled by the bosses and union bureaucrats—that Mexican workers, the so-called illegal aliens, are to blame for unemployment. He correctly says that the bosses “throw open the doors to this country to the humble and poor when they need their railroads built, sewages drained, and blast furnaces tended, and they throw them out when they can’t give them jobs.”

“I don’t believe we should have fences around this country,” Sudowki says. “We should be looking at ourselves as citizens of the world.”

Sudowki has credited the UWF with some of his ideas about what the labor movement should be. “We’ve got to develop a very strong cause in this country,” he said. “Chavez is a good example of that. It’s not just Mexican with the picket lines and setbacks he’s successful.”

To inject life into the steelworkers union it will be necessary to involve the whole community. It is another lesson to be learned from the farm workers.

This is not just an issue for Chico steelworkers. It is a struggle for all of la raza.

Chicanos have a big stake in the steelworkers election. A victory for the Fight Back slate will help open up the whole labor movement to the struggle of la raza. But it’s not a just a matter of voting. Involvement is the key.

Sudowki put it well: “Organize around the premise of what you want this union to be.” Chicanos should have plenty of good ideas about that.

¡La Raza en Acción!

Chicanos & steel

DENVER—Unions can be a powerful force for all kinds of progressive change. They can back up Chicanos not only on the job but also in the community—in the struggle for bilingual-bicultural education, for affirmative action, against police brutality, and against the abuses of prison guards.

The labor movement has the clout to win these struggles. And Chicanos have the right to expect its support. But we need to organize Chicanos to be transformed first to put it on the right track.

The union bureaucracy now cooperates with the bosses to throw up roadblocks—special interest to Chicanos.

In many plants, Mexican and mills under USWA contract—especially in the Southwest—Chicanos are a major part of the labor force. And Chicanos, Blacks, and women are hardest hit by the massive layoffs in the steel industry.

In the third stage, the Steelworkers Fight Back slate say that the unions must be run by the workers and respond to the needs of the workers. They are campaigning for the slate to win contracts and to eliminate the no-strike pledge that union President I.W. Abel signed with the steel companies.

The Steelworkers Fight Back movement aims to revive the fighting traditions of the unions. It points out that for unions to represent the interests of their members, they must be concerned with more than just wages and working conditions. They must take up the entire range of social and political issues affecting working people.

This is especially true for Chicanos, Blacks, and women, and for the workers as inseparable from their oppression as second-class citizens. One of the reasons the United Farm Workers union has been successful in organizing campesinos where others have failed is that it recognized that it must fight all forms of racism in the fields.

As one indication that Fight Back is serious about addressing itself to the oppressed, the slate includes Ignacio Rodriguez, a Chicano, who grew up in a shantytown in Nicaragua, a Black, and Firestone, all three of whom have been organizers in Monroe, Louisiana, were announced. The UAW won by a vote of 323 to 280. But this does not settle the matter. A contract has yet to be negotiated.

Vice-president Irving Bluestone, director of the union’s GM department, announced immediately that “UAW now will move quickly to bring the workers at the Monroe plant under the provisions of the union’s national agreement with GM and to work out local agreements that will be satisfactory to the Monroe workers.” This sounds as if those workers had just voted themselves a substantial wage raise plus other union benefits.

If it turns out that way, the news is sure to spread. Other unorganized plants will come under union control. It may be that the way is open to organize the rubber and electrical manufacturing industries.

What happened in Monroe is a sign. It heralds big changes that have been long delayed in the South.

Sudowki has denounced the racist myth—peddled by the bosses and union bureaucrats—that Mexican workers, the so-called illegal aliens, are to blame for unemployment. He correctly says that the bosses “throw open the doors to this country to the humble and poor when they need their railroads built, sewages drained, and blast furnaces tended, and they throw them out when they can’t give them jobs.”

“I don’t believe we should have fences around this country,” Sudowki says. “We should be looking at ourselves as citizens of the world.”

Sudowki has credited the UWF with some of his ideas about what the labor movement should be. “We’ve got to develop a very strong cause in this country,” he said. “Chavez is a good example of that. It’s not just Mexican with the picket lines and setbacks he’s successful.”

To inject life into the steelworkers union it will be necessary to involve the whole community. It is another lesson to be learned from the farm workers. This is not just an issue for Chico steelworkers. It is a struggle for all of la raza.

Chicanos have a big stake in the steelworkers election. A victory for the Fight Back slate will help open up the whole labor movement to the struggle of la raza. But it’s not just a matter of voting. Involvement is the key.

Sudowki put it well: “Organize around the premise of what you want this union to be.” Chicanos should have plenty of good ideas about that.

¡La Raza en Acción!

Miguel Pendas

La Raza in Action!
Socialist Workers party leader Linda Jenness returned December 12 from a three-week speaking tour in Spain. She spoke to large audiences on campuses and in working-class communities and met with leaders of the feminist, trade-union, and revolutionary movements. Following are major excerpts from Jenness’s report on her tour to 500 people attending a women’s liberation and socialism conference sponsored by the SWP and Young Socialist Alliance, at New York’s Columbia University December 18.

Jenness is a member of the SWP National Committee and was the party’s presidential candidate in 1972.

The feminist movement in Spain is bringing thousands of new women into the international fight for women’s rights. Within one short year it has become a major component of the developing revolution there. Just while I was in Barcelona, there was a demonstration of 5,000 women against adultery laws; a women’s festival featuring feminist protest singers that drew 4,000 people; and the meeting where I spoke on feminism and socialism attended by 2,000 teachers and students.

In addition, there are articles in the papers and magazines and often letters to the editors, debating one or another of these issues.

My tour itself was an indication of the interest in feminism. Not only were the meetings large in all six cities—2,000 in Barcelona, 700 in Valencia, 500 in Madrid, several others of 300 or 400—but the tour was covered in all the press and on radio and television.

In Seville I was on the radio five times. On one thirty-minute live program I talked about everything—feminism, abortion, divorce, the world Trotskyist movement, the need for socialist revolution in the United States and elsewhere.

The members of the Liga Comunista (LC—Communist League) and the Liga Comunista Revolucionaria (LCR—Revolu­tionary Communist League), the groups that arranged the tour, were shocked that this radio show was not cut off. They kept watching the control room to see if they had gotten away with cutting it. They said that this was the first time for forty years that a revolutionary socialist talked for thirty minutes on live radio.

What you have to understand is that the open discussion and debate of political ideas is new in Spain, because people have been living under a fascist dictatorship for forty years.

Phony referendum

While I was in Spain, another big issue was the referendum. This is a method of the ruling class to attempt to maneuver a transition from the Franco fascist dictatorship to a parliamentary form of government with a guise of democracy. The phony Francoist legislature passed a bill calling for elections and put it forward as a referendum.

Of course, there is just one big problem with the referendum and the elections: all parties except those that support the government are outlawed. The Communist party, the Trotskyist and Maoist parties, even women’s liberation organizations, are not legal. So the elections that will be held will exclude any opposition.

While I was in Spain, 134 members of the LCR were arrested for just holding a meeting. You can hardly talk about democratic elections when people are being arrested for simply holding a meeting.

Even two of my meetings were banned by the government, one in Madrid and one in Pamplona. You know that permission for your meeting has to be given, but in that case of Maria Angeles Munoz, a woman from Barcelona.

Maria Angeles Muñoz and her daughter were deserted by Maria’s husband several years ago. But, since there’s no divorce, the husband still retains legal power over her. The husband is accusing Maria Angeles of adultery and demanding custody of her daughter.

It was this case that triggered the protest of 5,000 women in Barcelona November 18. The protest was broken up by cops.

Those women who find their marriages intolerable have no legal way out. And, if they leave their husbands, they can be persecuted, prosecuted, and jailed under a variety of laws.

For instance, under the home abandoning law, any woman who leaves her home—either her husband’s if she is married, or her father’s if she is not married—without permission can be brought to trial and jailed. There are hundreds of women in jail for this crime.

If a married woman separates from her husband and lives with another man, she can be tried and thrown in jail for adultery.

Not only are these laws antiquated, but the double standard is flagrant. A married woman who “copulates with a man not her husband,” is automatically guilty. Her partner can only be found guilty if it can be proven that he knew she was married. If a husband sleeps with a woman who is not his wife, he can only be charged with adultery on two conditions: one, if he moves his mistress into his family household, or two, if he consorts with his mistress in public so flagrantly that it is embarrass­ing to the church and the state.

In the center of the fight against these scandalous adultery laws are several defense cases. One of these is the case of Maria Angeles Muñoz, a woman from Barcelona.

Maria Angeles Muñoz and her daughter were deserted by Maria’s husband several years ago. But, since there’s no divorce, the husband still retains legal power over her. The husband is accusing Maria Angeles of adultery and demanding custody of her daughter.

It was this case that triggered the protest of 5,000 women in Barcelona November 18. The protest was broken up by cops.

The feminist movement takes this case very seriously. It understands that Maria Angeles Muñoz can go to jail if convicted. In jail she would join hundreds of others imprisoned for adultery, home abandoning, and for having abortions. That’s why one of the main slogans of all the actions is amnesty for all the women in jail for “women’s” crimes.

Sit-in

It was also the case of Maria Angeles Muñoz that sparked the sit-in at a Barcelona church, which I participated in.

The women in Spain often have meetings and protests in churches, because generally they have immunity there from police arrest. I went to the sit-in at 10:30 a.m. Sunday. There were about fifty present then, although more than 200 participated at one time or another during the twenty-four hour period.

The discussion at this church was a mixture of business—what to do next with the action they were taking—and more personal discussions. Some women talked about their own situation at home
and asked for advice from some of the women lawyers there. Differences between the various groups and tendencies were also discussed. I had the strange feeling I’d been there before. It reminded me of some of the resistance meetings we had in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1969 when I lived there. I was periodically reminded that I was in Spain, where a bottle of wine that was being passed around the circle. I don’t remember doing that in Atlanta, at least not at 10 PM in the morning. I was also reminded where I was when a young woman came in and told me she should leave because the cops were outside, and if something happened I would probably lose the fight. I finally stopped and pulled down the big banners the women had hung up on the church and across the street demanding “Anarchy for all and ‘Abolish the sexist and discriminatory laws.”

But then, a little thing happened that would have been unbelievable six months or a year ago and is a sign of the growing combative and self-confidence of the workers in Spain. As soon as the cops had left, the men from the community ran over and sprayed the slogans back on the church with spray paint.

Fascism and sexism

All these laws—against divorce, adultery, home association, and abortion—are a result of the victory of fascism in Spain. In the 1930s during the Spanish Republic, there were only about 20,000 women that were entitled to certain rights. With the victory of fascism, rights were taken away from women. Fascism gave absolute power to capitalism’s holy trinity: the church, the state, and the family—or the pope, Franco, and your father.

I have to admit that one of the things that delighted me most about the tour was when I told audiences about the Catholic church’s reactionary role in our fight for abortion rights in this country. And there we were—how we answered the church: “The Catholic church, we said, is hypocritical. They cry about the lives of the unborn, but they don’t care about the living. The foundation of the Catholic church, we said, is ignorance. It is an institution built upon the oppression of women.”

Fascism and sexism are the immediate concerns for the feminist movement in Spain. The fight for contraceptives. Contraceptives for women are too expensive.

Hand in hand with the lack of contraceptives is the lack of abortion rights. Between these two restrictions, tens of thousands of women are forced into illegal, dangerous abortions. Many die, many are maimed, and many are jailed. A sign of the growing impact of the feminist movement in Spain is the recent convention of Partido Socialista Obrero Español—the social-democratic party—adopted a women’s rights platform that included the demand for free, legal abortions.

Round table

One of the most interesting meetings I had was what was called a round-table discussion. At this round table, the leaders of some of the major women’s organizations got together to discuss with me what was going on in Spain and to share experiences.

One group represented was the Collectiva Feminista (Feminist Collective), the group led by Lydia Falco. Falco is the Spanish feminist who was sent to jail several years ago, along with her sister, Forest, for her feminist ideas. She is the author of several books, a lawyer, and certainly one of the prominent feminists in Spain.

The women in Falco’s group are called the radical feminists. Although small in numbers, they are active and have small groups all over Spain. These are the women who believe that women are a class—not an oppressed sex—but a class. They recognize the women’s oppression began with the division of society into classes, the development of private property, and the institution of the family.

Instead, they believe that women were always oppressed and that the basic fight is between men and women. They are truly opposed to women, belonging to political parties that include men. In fact, they think that women who do belong to parties, including revolutionary parties, are not really feminists.

I don’t believe there is much future for this group in Spain. The women’s liberation movement is developing along with, and in the midst of, a giant workers’ struggle.

Here in the United States, when revolutionary socialist women said to the radical feminists, “Yes, we have to build an independent women’s movement, but women also have to be part of the class struggle for socialism,” the radical feminists—acting out of fear or from a position purely in front of them—used to say, “What class struggle?”

Well, in Spain you can’t say that. It’s more obvious than sexism, the movement can’t isolate itself from everything else.

Then there’s the Asociación Democrática de Mujeres (Democratic Association of Women). This is primarily led by the Workers party, a Maoist group. The Asociación is in a contradictory situation. The leadership’s position, as explained to me at the round table, is that women should fight only as part of the general struggle for democracy against fascism. Then, only after there’s a more democratic situation, should women fight for their special interests as women.

On the other hand, because of the number of women in this group who are not Maoists, and because of the pressure of the feminist movement, the organization is forced to participate in women’s liberation struggles.

When the leadership tells women that they should fight for democracy against fascism, the women say, “Of course, that’s what we’re doing—we’re fighting for divorce and abortion rights. We’re fighting for our democratic rights.”

The Communist party, which is also reluctant to build the independent feminist movement, is also forced to participate. It is especially active in amas de casa, housewives’ organizations. These groups have been successfully fighting against inflation and high prices.

Democratic demands

The Frente de Liberación de Mujer (Women’s Liberation Front), considers itself a socialist-feminist group. Although its ranks include sincere young feminists, they make a lot of mistakes. For instance, when they demand divorce at the round table, the women from the Frente explained that they were not fighting for the right to divorce, but for rights that a bourgeois society would simply strengthen the bourgeois family. They are trying to build the women’s movement—so they don’t have to start totally from scratch. They can use many of the experiences and lessons, the books and literature, and the weight and authority gained by women here and in England, Japan, France, Italy, Canada, and elsewhere.

Their movement also starts in the midst of a combative mood on the part of the workers class in Spain. That combative will include the readiness to build the world-wide feminist movement, and the double oppression of working women.

I’m sure that the feminists the world over are inspired to see our ranks swell with new battalions from Spain. It gives us confidence in our movement and confidence in our victory.

Protests free CP leader

By Peter Seidman

On December 30, Santiago Carrillo, general secretary of the Communist party of Spain, was released on $4,400 bail. He had been held in Carabanchel prison outside Madrid for nine days on charges of belonging to an “illegal association.” The charge carries a potential sentence of six months in prison.

Carrillo was arrested December 22 along with seven other CP leaders who have also been released. Twelve days earlier the officially barred CP leader had revealed at a news conference in Madrid that he had been living in Spain since February. He demanded that the government end its ban on the CP.

Demonstrations in Madrid and protests by numerous European Communist parties greeted Carrillo’s arrest. These convinced the regime that its demagogic efforts to present a more liberalized image would be dealt too costly a blow by continued prosecution of the CP leaders. According to the Left, the newest of these a few days ago it seems “more and more likely that the case will never come to trial.”

A spokesperson for the Spanish CP hailed Carrillo’s release as “an important step toward the legalization of all political parties in Spain.”

On the same day the regime announced it was abolishing the Court of Public Order. This court was established by Franco in 1963. It has been responsible for blocking legal appeals for freedom of hundreds of political prisoners.
Rejects Austin busing plan

Supreme Court ruling new blow to Blacks

By Peter Seidman

On December 7, the U.S. Supreme Court rejected a court-ordered desegregation plan for Austin, Texas. The plan would have mandated the busing of nearly 25,000 students.

In the seven-to-two ruling, the court majority laid down a highly restrictive standard of how far lower courts can go in order to act to overcome segregated education.

The busing plan overturned by the Supreme Court had been adopted by a federal appeals court. That three-judge panel in New Orleans had rejected a partial desegregation plan submitted by the Austin school board as inadequate. The partial plan, for example, did not provide for desegregation below the sixth grade.

But the Supreme Court’s December 7 ruling that a school desegregation plan went too far. It explained that “the remedy ordered appears to exceed the necessary to eliminate the effect of any official acts” of racial discrimination.

The justices said the court-ordered plan imposes “a view of the constitutional obligations of a school board for overriding desire expressed by this Court.” It held that “large-scale busing is proper only where the evidence supports a finding that the extent of integration sought to be achieved by busing would have existed had the school authorities fulfilled their constitutional obligations in the past.”

This means busing can only be ordered where it can be proven that school officials intentionally discriminated against minority students.

Why desegregation fight must continue

By Chris Horner

BOSTON—Why is the struggle for school desegregation so important? And where does this struggle stand today?

These were among the questions addressed by a panel of probing leaders during the National Student Conference Against Racism held here this fall.

The National Student Coalition Against Racism (NSCAR), which hosted the conference, was founded in February 1975 to organize student support for school desegregation and other antiracist struggles in Boston and other cities.

Tony Austin, the chair of the desegregation panel, was selected as the new NSCAR national coordinator. The previous coordinator, Maceo Dixon, also spoke on the panel.

Dixon explained that the largest demonstrations for Black rights in recent years have been in defense of school desegregation, while the largest mobilizations against Black rights have been in opposition to busing.

Any challenge to segregated schools, Dixon said, confronts the highly segregated housing patterns in American cities. Since these patterns are intertwined with discriminatory lower wages and higher unemployment among Blacks, the school desegregation fight is closely tied to Black people’s fight for economic equality.

Dixon pointed to renewed threats in Congress to pass antibusing amendments. He called attention to the highly segregated character of school systems in America’s three largest cities—New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. These are warning signs, Dixon said, that NSCAR’s participation in the antibusing struggle needs to continue.

Dixon urged conference participants to continue NSCAR’s educational campaign on busing. He urged NSCAR activists to continue to work with trade unions, NAACP chapters, and groups such as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the Urban League to build unified mobilizations in defense of busing.

Three other panelists also spoke: Jane Carver, a staff organizer for Progress In Education, a Louisville probusing organization; Christine Rossell, a Boston University professor currently writing a book on the Boston busing struggle to be entitled The Little Rock of the North; and Luis Fuentes, the first Puerto Rican principal in the New York City school system and a longtime activist in the fight for bilingual-educational curricula.

Carver recounted the violence that greeted the implementation of busing in Louisville in 1974. She noted public officials who claimed they would obey the court order, while actually giving backhanded encouragement to racist mobs by expressing their “personal opposition” to busing.

Carver explained that the opening of schools this fall was relatively peaceful. But, she said, the racism has shifted from the streets to the classrooms, where violence and a variety of subtle methods are being used to undo the initial victory achieved through busing.

Young Blacks, who make up 25 percent of Louisville’s student population, suffer 69 percent of school suspensions. About 25 percent of those above sixteen, she said, are encouraged to drop out. And teachers have been laid off in the name of a “budget crisis.” Meanwhile, top school administrators are paid up to $45,000 a year.

Rossell reported that the large majority of school districts in the United States remain segregated. Within those districts that have been desegregated, little has been achieved at the classroom level. Because of tracking of Blacks into remedial classes, they are still shortchanged.

The price paid by these victims of racist New York City education is high. For example, Fuentes said, the unemployment rate for Puerto Ricans between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five is 50 percent.

Fuentes blasted the racist opposition to bilingual education by Albert Shanker, leader of New York’s United Federation of Teachers. Fuentes told the conference what happened when he tried to follow one of Shanker’s suggestions. Shanker had proposed that instead of hiring bilingual teachers, the schools could provide voluntary instruction in Spanish to English-speaking teachers.

“‘In 1972,’ Fuentes reported, ‘I initiated a bilingual education program for Cantonese and Spanish, meeting with 900 mono-lingual teachers. Two hundred showed up for the class that number attended. The classes had to be scrapped.’

Tony Austin, Christine Rossell, and Luis Fuentes are all available through NSCAR’s national speakers bureau. For more information, contact NSCAR at 612 Blue Hill Avenue, Dorchester, Massachusetts 02121. Telephone: (617) 284-6500.
In 1968 Andrew Pulley went into the army rather than go to jail. He had been arrested for taking part in the Black community rebellion in Cleveland following the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.

In the army, Pulley became one of the Fort Jackson Eight, who in 1969 were thrown into the stockade for their antiauthoritarian activities. An internationalist campaign to defend GI civil liberties forced the army to drop its charges. Pulley later joined the Young Socialist Alliance, was elected its national chairperson, and in 1972 ran for U.S. vice-president on the Socialist Workers party ticket.

The following are excerpts from Pulley’s testimony when he was cross-examined by Assistant U.S. Attorney William Brandt last May.

The testimony is part of the pretrial evidence being collected for the $40 million lawsuit the SWP and YSA have brought against government harassment.

Q. Would you tell us briefly, Mr. Pulley, your educational background?
A. I attended elementary school, junior high school, high school, one semester of college in California.

Q. Could you tell me, Mr. Pulley, when you completed high school?
A. I did not complete high school.

Q. I am sorry. Did you say you attended high school?
A. I attended high school from about ’62 to ’68, that is, junior high school and a year of high school.

Q. Oh, you had a year of high school.
A. Yes. To the tenth grade.

Q. Could you tell us when in 1967 or 1968 you were arrested for allegedly inciting a riot?
A. Yes. In 1968. It was in April, a few days following the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.

Q. What happened after you were arrested? Were you tried?
A. No. I was not tried. It was put in a temporary detention home and charges were being brought, during which time I was put on probation. My probation officer pointed out the choices facing me. That was jail or joining the army to escape being tried for incitement to riot charge. And I joined the army in May.

Q. Could you give us the approximate date that you entered the army, sir?
A. May 22, 1968.

Q. Could you tell us the date you left the army?
A. May 23, 1969.

Q. So you were in the army for approximately a year?
A. A year and one day.

Q. Did you engage in any political activities while you were in the army?
A. I engaged in antiauthoritarian discussion and discussion against racist practices in the army. You can call that political if you want. Of all of which was, of course, legal under both the Constitution and the UCMJ, Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Q. Could you tell us what you were in the army? Were you a member of a group called the GIs United Against the War?
A. Yes, I was at Fort Jackson.

Q. Did there come a time in March of 1969 that you were placed in the stockade?
A. That is correct, for about two months.

Q. Could you tell us the events leading up to your being placed in the stockade?
A. I was arrested along with eight other GIs for allegedly having disobeyed a direct order to disperse; for illegally demonstrating on the base without a permit; for breach of peace; disrespect to an officer; and some other charges.

And this stemmed from a legal, peaceful gathering of GIs talking about the war in Vietnam and other things.

And all charges were subsequently dropped before any court-martial took place. So in effect we only had a grand jury investigation.

Q. Were you given a discharge as a result of that proceeding?
A. No, not exactly as a result of that proceeding.

Q. You were given an undesirable discharge?
A. I was given an undesirable discharge, though.

Q. Were you one of those leaders?
A. In that sense, yes.

Antiwar work

Q. Did you engage in any antiwar activities during that period, June, July of 1969, while on discharge from the army?
A. Certainly.

Q. Could you tell me the nature of your antiwar activities?
A. Well, I attended a couple of antiwar conferences and meetings and rallies, things of that sort.

Q. Did you give any speeches at that time?
A. Yes, I made talks. I talked about the need to oppose the war in Vietnam and to convince the American people of that.

Q. Did you engage in any activities on behalf of Black liberation movement?
A. I spoke about the need to end racist attacks and restain, the need to change from a system that profits from it and perpetuates it to one that is the opposite.

Q. Did you attend the national antiwar conference in Cleveland? Did you give a speech at that time?
A. Yes, I spoke from the floor a couple of times.

Q. Could you tell us the nature of your statements at that time?
A. Well, it was along the general line of the need to mobilize the masses of people in the streets to oppose the war.
Predicts victory

Attorney maps defense of YSA activists

By Meg Hayes

DETROIT—"Central Michigan University is trying to suppress political ideas," said a student yesterday in his defense of a Young Socialist Alliance member.

The three—Brigid Douglas, Jim Garrison, and Tom Smith—were arrested October 28 for distributing Socialist Workers party campaign literature at CMU. One defendant is charged with three counts of criminal trespass and illegal occupancy of a university building by force.

Douglas has represented political activists in the past twelve years. He is convinced a victory can be won in this case. His plans to argue in court that the three YSA members had a constitutional right to distribute political literature and campaign for the candidates of their choice.

"The law is clear," Reosti said. "Campus regulations cannot be used as a substitute for preventing political activity."

The CMU administration claims that the three socialists refused to comply with regulations for their own benefit. These campus rules require forms for recognition of organizations, literature table reservations, and permission to sell literature.

Socialist steelworkers hold conference

By Andy Rose

CHICAGO—Socialist Steelworkers from a dozen states gathered here December 18-19 in a national conference sponsored by the Socialist Workers party.

The conference was held to discuss the significance of Ed Sadlowski's campaign for president of the United Steelworkers and the participation of socialists in the developing movement for democratic and militant unionism.

Frank Lovell, SWP national trade union director, noted in opening the gathering, "We are reviving an old tradition in our party." "The last such conference that I can remember was in 1947 in Detroit when the auto workers met to plan their battle strategy to defend the traditions and institutions of the United Auto Workers against the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists and government agents of all kinds who had infiltrated the union."

Lovell added that the prospects for a successful unionization are far brighter today than they were thirty years ago on the eve of the cold-war witch-hunt.

This conference brought together activists in the Steelworkers Fight Back campaign from California, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Wisconsin. They reported on the campaign's progress in their areas.

All noted the extraordinary receptivity of steelworkers to Sadlowski's call for a union controlled by the membership and fighting for the membership. Heisler presided. A national perspectives report to the conference.

Morale high as Miami hotel strike continues

By Bob Angeles

MIAMI—Every winter the luxury Miami Beach hotels fill up for the season. Tourists pay from $50 to $100 a day for rooms in some of the most famous hotels in the world. But the workers who clean the rooms support their families on as little as $60 a week.

Recently hotel owners raised rates 20 percent, and they refused to budge on workers' wage demands when union contracts ran out last September. After three months without a contract, Local 355 of the Hotel, Motel and Restaurant Employees Union called a strike. On Christmas Day, 5,000 workers walked off the job.

The union's demands were modest: a 10 percent average increase in wages; increased hospitalization insurance; and guaranteed prepaid tips for maids who work on convention and tour group guests.

The union plan for prepaid tips was simple. Each convention or tour group guest would be charged $1.50 a day by the hotels. The amount was revised downward to $1.60 in agreements the union reached with thirteen hotel managements. It is this demand that a number of the largest hotels have refused to agree to.

Though the strike is in its second week, the spirit and determination of the strikers is high. They are out to win. As one striker told me, "We will not go back without a contract. Then we will go back together!"

Most of the Miami-area organized labor movement backs that sentiment. A number of unions, including the United Steelworkers of America and the American Federation of Teachers, have now conducting their own organizing drives. They correctly see that a hotel workers' victory could help their chances of winning and that a defeat could hurt them. The December 27 meeting of the Dade Federation of Labor voted unanimously to back the strike and called on AFL-CIO international unions to hold their conventions away from Miami Beach until the strike is settled.

One exception to this display of solidarity is the local musicians union. The musicians, who are not members of the Dade Federation of Labor, have refused to honor picket lines. If they did honor the pickets, they could have a big impact on the success of the strike, since entertainment is one of the main attractions the big hotels offer.

Another obstacle facing the strikers is the employers' attempt to replace the strikers with scabs. As in many other industries in south Florida, the hotel owners have conversely replaced Black workers with Cubans as immigrants. Today Cubans make up 80 percent of the hotel work force.

The same hotel owners who pushed Black workers out the door fifteen years ago are now trying to get them to work for the promise of "permanent" jobs.

Although those employers haven't been able to recruit significant numbers of scabs this way, their attempt undermines the unity of the union to vigorously seek Black community support for the strike. The union is in a very strong position, since it has done little to oppose the racist hiring practices of the hotel owners. Taking a firm stand against the owners' racist hiring practices would be a first step toward turning this situation around.

Reosti emphasized the national importance of the CMU case. "A victory for the CMU defendants," he said, "would mean that the strategy that we believe is a strategy that would otherwise be adopted by other major universities, a strategy to silence political ideas by a labyrinth of regulations."
A group that stands behind what it says

By Nancy Cole

CHICAGO—"We intend to think big, and we intend to be bold and stand strong in Houston," delegate Veronica Fontenot told the recent national convention of the Young Socialist Alliance here.

Fontenot has good cause for her optimism. During the last couple of months her YSA chapter in northeast Houston has grown to seventeen—all of them Black junior or senior high school students.

Fifteen of them made the tedious, twenty-four-hour trip to the Chicago convention December 31-January 2.

"Anyone who wants to struggle to support the freedom fighters in South Africa, anyone who wants to struggle to win the Equal Rights Amendment, anyone who wants to demand justice in the case of Milton Glover should be in our YSA chapter," Veronica said during discussion of the convention’s “Building the YSA” report. (Glover was a Houston Black killed by cops.)

Veronica was one of three delegates—all women—representing what must be the youngest YSA chapter in the nation. The group got its start about five months ago when Veronica’s sister Rene joined the YSA.

Rene joined the socialist movement as an activist in the Student Coalition Against Racism. Then Terry Payne, a student at the same school, entered Senior High—also joined. Veronica Fontenot soon followed.

The YSA at Kashmere grew rapidly into a chapter after that, and Rene Fontenot was elected president and vice-president of their sophomore class. They ran on a socialist platform, and "the students loved it," Rene told me. "People started asking questions about socialism."

They were both elected.

Since the administration would not permit the YSA status as a school club, they helped form a political science club.

This fall the club invited representatives of the national presidential campaigns to speak at school. Only the Socialist Workers party’s speaker, Silvia Zapata, showed up.

“She convinced a whole lot of people about socialism,” Rene Fontenot explained.

The mock election netted $395 weekly.

"I joined the YSA because my friend Milton Glover got killed by the cops," fifteen-year-old Calvin Charles told me. "I knew his family and his girlfriend. I knew everything about him. He was nice, he was friendly, and everything else."

David Brown, seventeen, added, "It wasn’t right, because Milton Glover pulled out a Bible and they said it was a gun. And they shot him seven times. Nothing happened to those officers, and I felt like something should have. That’s the reason I joined the YSA."

The YSA participated actively in an independent commission of inquiry, which this September brought in a verdict of murder. This convinced a number of the students that the YSA was the group to be in.

During one of the convention’s dinner breaks, the students went to an interview with the Militant, where they added other reasons for joining the YSA. The fifteen, crowded into a small hotel room, range in age from fourteen to eighteen.

There’s a lot of laughter. Some are extremely shy and have to be pushed by the others to speak. But they’re all serious when they tell what led them to join the YSA.

“<i>My mother told me I should join something that was important</i>,” explains fourteen-year-old Monique McKnight.

"Why should I just sit around and let someone else do the work when I should really be out there trying to make change?" offers David Brown, seventeen.

"The YSA seems like an organization that really stands behind what they say they’re going to do," says Carl Madison.

They all say they’ve enjoyed the convention, especially the chance to talk to YSA members from other cities. The only complaint expressed in unison is that there’s been no hot water in their hotel rooms. It’s been cold showers every morning.

When they’re done talking, they pull out scraps of paper. It’s rehearsal time. Curtis Hannibal, president of the Kashmere drama club, has written and choreographed a play they will perform at that night’s convention rally.

"Hey! We’re the Blacks from the YSA. We’re the present, the future, and yesterday. We’re for justice, socialism, and all the rest. We are the YSA and we are the best!"

It’s the smash hit of the rally.

"We need a change in the YSA," chapter organizer Rene Fontenot said in remarks under the convention’s “Fight Against Racism” report. "We need a change for more Blacks and minorities."

"Next year I plan to bring a hundred Black students to the convention."

Pickets greet opening night

“Ipi Tombi’ exploits Black South Africans

By Earl Williams

YORK—The advertisement proclaims, "Happiness is an African musical called Ipi-Tombi." But at the show’s December 29 preview, some 500 demonstrators here brought another message to the crowd at the Harkness Theater.

Organized by the Emergency Committee to Protest the South African Production of Ipi-Tombi, the protesters blasted the show for its exploitation of Black African artists and culture, as well as its portrayal of what life for Black people is like under apartheid.

The Emergency Committee was established after members of the cast of the London—-all of them Ipi-Tombi—delegates wrote to Marcia Ann Gillespie, editor of Essence magazine here in the United States.

In their letter, the cast members complained that they were outrageously underpaid—their total pay was fourteen dollars a week. They also protested the profiteering on the musical and its public relations director Max Eisen, has been raised to no less than $395 weekly.

The demonstrators at preview night denounced Ipi-Tombi’s exploitation of South African Blacks’ culture. And they also scored the show’s attempt to depict life under apartheid as happily go-lucky.

According to the January 1 Amsterdam News, these themes evoked a positive response from theatergoers: "The play…was delayed for over one hour by the demonstration and scores of sympathetic patrons who demanded a refund of their advance ticket purchases.

As these rebellious customers exerted the theater, with their ticket money raised in a clinched fist, they were greeted by a running round of applause

Contributors
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'ipi Tombi' protests Black South Africans
Texas campesinos call for right to unionize

By Rick Congress
HOUSTON—The Texas Farm Work­ers Union has launched a statewide campaign to establish a fund to pay for the right of agricultural workers to form unions and to improve their working conditions.

The focus is on a bill to be introduced into the January 1977 session of the state legislature by Rep. C. L. González Barrientos, an Austin Democrat. The proposed law is patterned after the California Agricultural Labor Relations Act.

The TFW is an independent union of farmworkers organized by the Chicano farmworkers. It aims to organize farmworkers into unions and to improve their working conditions by establishing a fund to pay for the right of farmworkers to form unions.

The union has already reported eighteen earlier accidents. and Houston to set up offices to support union organizing. The union is expected to fuel ongoing opposition to the National Maritime Union, the major union of shipworkers. Environmental organizations and the National Maritime Union are especially concerned about the environmental impact of oil spills.

The recent disasters have already provoked new protests by environmental and labor groups. The pressure is on to pay women less than men for the same work. Because of the economic crisis, women and minority workers are most affected, since they are the last hired and first fired. Many affirmative-action gains have been wiped out due to discriminatory layoffs. The measure is on to pay women less and drive them out of the labor market if possible. The government is trying to organize the Texas Raza Unida party strongly against amnesty.

In the last several months, proamnesty organizations such as Amex-Canada have stepped up efforts to demand that Carter grant a general amnesty. In early December, a group that included parents of Vietnam War resisters and veterans with less-than-honorable discharges held a vigil outside Carter's church in Plains, Georgia. They unsuccessfully sought to present Carter with a letter of support signed by environmental leaders and labor leaders. Carter aides have already indicated that they have reached "substantial agreement" with the recommendations of the pardon plan to the incoming president. However, no details of the new proposal have been released and what Carter will actually do during the week following January 20 remains a mystery.

After Carter makes his decision, proamnesty forces have said they will challenge it in court. In Canada, the Liberals are now the overwhelming favorite to win the election. The Canada election is expected to be a hotly contested race, with both major parties fighting for the votes of women and Black workers.

In November, proamnesty organizations such as Amex-Canada and the Catholic Worker will join with the Socialist Workers party and other groups in calling for a broad-based campaign to support amnesty. The group also announced plans to hold a national conference to discuss the amnesty issue and to recommend the next step. The conference will be held in New York City on December 29-30.

The group also decided to continue the campaign, but without the support of the Socialist Workers party. The group will continue to call for a broad-based campaign to support amnesty, and will call for a national conference to discuss the amnesty issue and to recommend the next step.
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By Diane Rupp

CHICAGO—"Our message to our brothers and sisters in South Africa, and students around the world, is that the Young Socialist Alliance is going to put the U.S. government on notice. We are not a small minority but part of the majority that opposes minority rule in southern Africa," declared Rick Berman in his report to the YSA convention.

"The student movement is alive and well and ready to build a movement that can end U.S. support to racism in southern Africa once and for all."

Seven hundred delegates and guests attended the YSA's sixteenth national convention in Chicago December 31-January 2. Students came from twenty-nine states and the District of Columbia, representing YSA members on 150 high school and college campuses.

Cathy Sedwick, who reported to the convention on the freedom struggle in southern Africa, explained the YSA's decision to launch a campaign against racist white minority rule. At a New Year's Day news conference here Sedwick told reporters: "We believe the 26 million college and high school students in the United States can initiate a movement like the antwar movement that forced the government out of Vietnam."

Sedwick said the YSA would build the demonstrations scheduled for March 25 and 26 called by the National Student Coalition Against Racism. These nationwide protests will demand immediate Black majority rule in southern Africa, freedom for all political prisoners, and an end to U.S. aid to racist regimes in South Africa, Namibia, and Zimbabwe (Rhodesia).

Nancy Brown, YSA women's liberation director and editor of the monthly Young Socialist newspaper, described recent attacks on women's rights. "1976 wasn't a good year for women," she said. "The Equal Rights Amendment was defeated in four states. Legal abortion came under attack. Child-care centers were shut down. Affirmative-action programs were slashed. And maternity rights for working women and Social Security benefits for divorced women were struck down by the Supreme Court."

The convention decided to undertake a major effort to turn back these attacks and extend women's rights.

The convention discussed activities planned for January 22, anniversary of the 1973 Supreme Court decision legalizing abortion, and March 8, International Women's Day.

The convention also pledged to defend Brigid Douglas, Jim Garrison, and Tom Smith, three YSA members who are being victimized by administrators at Central Michigan University in Mount Pleasant, Michigan, for distributing Socialist Workers party campaign literature. (See article on page 28.)

"If we don't halt these attacks on student rights they will deepen," said Joanne Tortorici, convention delegate from Pasadena, California. "A defeat at CMU would be a defeat for the YSA and students everywhere."

The wide variety of YSA activities was shown in other reports and workshops held during the three-day conference. In these sessions, YSA members discussed:

- Protests against the death penalty and defense of frame-up victims such as Gary Tyler;
- Fights against education cutbacks and tuition increases;
- Defense of minority admissions programs that help provide Blacks, Chicanos, and Puerto Ricans equal educational opportunities;
- Defense of democratic rights through the lawsuits the YSA and Socialist Workers party have filed against CIA and FBI harassment and disruption; and
- Support for community and trade-union struggles, such as Ed Sedlowski's Steelworkers Fight Back campaign to democratize the United Steelworkers union.

Seventeen high school students in Houston formed the YSA's newest—and youngest—chapter. Page 29.
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