moment, must entail the perspective of involving the broadest social forces of present-day society in the struggle against capitalism. Capitalism is the fountainhead of political reaction in general and of KKK and neo-Nazi terror in particular.

It is impossible to conduct a consistent anti-fascist policy unless one takes into account the key and decisive factor in overwhelming and destroying the fascist menace; it is the working class, the oppressed people and their allies. There can be no substitute, however one tries, for involving the broadest masses of workers and oppressed to overwhelm the fascist threat.

The fascist menace cannot be legislated out of existence. The employment of legal, judicial, and other methods in the struggle against fascism is necessary and often indispensible as a prerequisite to winning the broadest sections of the masses. But reliance upon the capitalist state to effectuate political measures directed against the threat of fascism is a hopeless, deadly illusion.

At nowhere, and at no time, has a capitalist government ever effectuated legislation clearly directed against fascism and proscribed existing fascist organizations without at the same time also limiting and proscribing the existence of revolutionary, working-class organizations.

The general tendency of capitalist legislation against fascist organizations generally comes down to banning "subversive organizations in general" which is an umbrella formula to prohibit progressive working-class and revolutionary organizations while at the same time protecting and defending the rightwing and fascist organizations.

Lessons of Buffalo

The Buffalo experience has shown in microcosm what the bourgeoisie is capable of doing when faced with a fascist threat. When the mayor of Buffalo was finally forced to take cognizance of the Nazi-KKK demonstration, he and the capitalist establishment, with the complete cooperation of (if not in conspiracy with) the capitalist media, moved to ban the anti-fascist demonstration under cover of banning both the Right and the Left.

This is a classical example of how a terrified capitalist city administration reacts when challenged by a neo-Nazi-KKK threat. First, they try to do nothing. Then they get their liberal friends and luminaries to ridicule the neo-Nazi menace and say that it doesn't exist. And then when the menace shows determination to demonstrate in the heart of the city, they advise the workers and the oppressed to boycott it, ignore it in the face of racist murders which have yet to be solved.

When all this fails and when a counter-demonstration against the KKK and Nazis shows promise of encompassing a broad coalition of civil rights, progressive, and working-class organizations to effectively confront the KKK and Nazi thugs, then (and only then) does the capitalist city administration assume its posture of "fighting" against the Nazis. But how? By presumably banning both demonstrations, but in reality aiming to ban only the anti-fascist demonstration.

What was truly important about the Buffalo experience was that a militant and progressive coalition demonstrated a determination to go through with its demonstration in the face of an illegal and unconstitutional ban. And finally the mayor and the capitalist establishment were forced to abandon the ban in the face of this militant and inflexible determination to hold the demonstration and not surrender the right to freedom of assembly in the face of the combined threats by the capitalist government, the press and the police.

In a further effort to try to displace, discredit and frighten the mass of the people away from the militant anti-fascist coalition, the mayor and the city administration were obliged to sponsor their own government-supported and establishment-controlled rally to honor Martin Luther King.

Intransigence, which is so indispensible in any working class struggle, did not alone account for the victory of the anti-fascist, progressive coalition in Buffalo. It was also careful assessment of the political relationship of forces in the area and in the country. It was good, efficient organization, free from any dogmatic approach to the phenomenon of fascist violence, free from sectarianism. It was reliance on the mass of the workers and progressives, and attempts to achieve the broadest possible alliance with all elements willing, ready and able to put up a vigorous struggle.

Buffalo was a microcosm of what the ruling class can and will do in the face of a fascist menace. It is also a microcosm of what can be done to achieve victory in the face of what appear to be overwhelming odds.

January 25, 1981

Workers World Vol. 23 No. 5, January 30, 1981

No, Reagan is *not* moving from right to center

At this early stage in the Reagan administration, it is easy to get distracted by the struggle of conflicting factional groupings among the Reaganites over the lucrative booty that comes as a prize in having won the administration of the capitalist state.

One must, however, be able to distinguish between a river and a puddle. Here, confusion abounds.

For example, the capitalist media has opened a campaign to present Reagan as "gentle," "amiable," "compassionate," and above all "moving from the right to the center." This was most clearly put by the *New York Times* in its editorial commentary of January 21, 1981 on the Reagan inaugural. The *Times* characterized Reagan as having abandoned the right for the center.

Recent columns in the capitalist press have begun to fortify this impression.

It is, however, a trap for the progressive movement and for all who are able and willing to put up a struggle against the reactionary domestic and adventurous military policy of the Reaganites.

Even though it is still in the very early days of the Reagan rule, this much already holds true.

Sen. Jesse Helms [left], an extreme rightwinger, and Frank Carlucci [right], the notorious deputy CIA director under Carter. Reagan isn't moving from the right to the center; it's the whole capitalist establishment that is continuing to evolve rightward.

No advance notice of nuclear maneuver

Consider this:

Just yesterday, the Strategic Air Command (SAC), that is, the nuclear forces of the U.S., began a truly significant military exercise "without notice," reports the Associated Press (*New York Times*, January 26, 1981).

What is meant by the phrase "without notice"? Does it mean without notice to the Environmental Protection Agency which certainly would be interested in getting advance notice in view of the hazards involved? Does it mean without notice to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the public in general, or even to the president? Or does it conceivably mean without the notice that is required by SALT II? According to this unratified treaty the U.S. and the USSR are obligated to give each other notice of military maneuvers involving strategic forces.

This matter is not of little moment. The exercise, called Global Shield '81, is scheduled, according to the Pentagon release, to extend for twenty days. Moreover, it involves in excess of 100,000 people and as many as 800 aircraft.

The Pentagon informs us that it is merely for training and testing and that it is not related to "real world situations."

What is that supposed to mean? That this nuclear exercise is not related to the Soviet Union or oppressed countries? Or that it is not related to the U.S. imperialist allies? Is this exercise only meant to simulate "hypothetical enemy targets"?

If it is not related to the USSR, then shouldn't it be assumed that the simulated exercise of the nuclear forces is to be used against oppressed countries, like Iran?

If the USSR began to carry out an exercise of its strategic nuclear forces without notice to NATO, wouldn't this have been big news, and an occasion for anti-Soviet war propaganda?

The Pentagon release said that at one point during the exercise more than 400 planes, many of them B-52s and FB-111 bombers, will take off simultaneously from airfields across the whole country. These bombers and missile crews will then receive orders to simulate attacks against what the Pentagon calls hypothetical enemy targets.

How are the hypothetical enemies supposed to view this threatening military muscle flexing? Are they supposed to take this calmly? What will be their reaction, particularly after the governments of the U.S. and the USSR had agreed that neither should undertake such dangerous and costly maneuvers without giving the other prior notice?

Where was the capitalist media when it could have brought out the plans for these maneuvers ahead of time, even if it was for the purpose of showing how costly they are and how they involve danger to life and limb even as a mere military exercise?

The Pentagon hasn't been shy in admitting that this military exercise is "the largest and most comprehensive exercise of strategic readiness ever undertaken." And, let us repeat, "without notice."

Every military command in their corresponding country never really knows for sure whether an exercise like this one is merely a military maneuver or the real thing. When this is considered, is this exercise not a frightening development, especially at the beginning of a new administration in Washington?

Mythical 'shift to center'

Yet, we are told in a four-column story in the *New York Times* on January 25, 1981 how the Reagan administration is shifting from right to center. This bolsters the view that Reagan, after all, is turning out to be a moderate, of all things. The Reagan administration, we are told, has found itself "under attack from conservative legislators and activists who were among Reagan's earliest and most ardent supporters."

The attacks focus on naming so-called moderates and "non-ideological Republicans" to high-level jobs. These are not non-ideological functionaries. They are rightwingers in ideology without organizational ties to any of the particular factions in the spectrum of the rightwing.