

What you should know about the WWP, IAC and ANSWER

What You Should Know about
ANSWER, the Workers World Party
and the International Action Center

""War is not the Answer, but neither is A.N.S.W.E.R""

-- popular chant during October 26, 2001 anti-war march in Washington, DC.

International A.N.S.W.E.R. is not the answer. That is the conclusion which has been reached by the majority of the American anti-war movement after two years of ANSWER's efforts to "lead" the American anti-war and peace movements. ANSWER bills itself as a coalition, but it is nothing of the sort. ANSWER is a front group organized by Stalinists associated with the Workers World Party. ANSWER has led the anti-war movement around in circles for two years, continuing its practice of organizing safe protests which promote the organization, but do nothing to slow down the war or even bring us one day closer to abolishing the U.S. war machine. What's more, scarce movement resources have been diverted into ANSWER's organization, which has only helped promote the authoritarian politics of the WWP. ANSWER has squandered movement resources on symbolic protests in Washington and San Francisco which every seasoned activist can tell you are a waste of time. ANSWER isn't interested in ending any war--they want to be in control of any new social change movements that grow in the United States.

The International Action Center is a prominent Left organization located in New York City which is known for organizing large Left protests. What most people don't know is that an authoritarian Left organization stands behind the IAC, an organization known as the [Workers World Party](#). Both organizations have been criticized by Left activists for supporting unsavory leaders such as Saddam Hussein and Slobodan Milosevic. They support these unsavory rulers because they subscribe to a shallow version of anti-imperialism. Quite simply, they will support any regime, no matter how vile they really are, if that regime is opposed to U.S. imperialism and aggression.

The IAC and WWP have also been criticized for their authoritarian activist methods and for their cooperation with the police.

The IAC are like the "Borg" of the Left. They always want to be friends with you and they want you to sign onto their projects. They get the momentum going for their projects by creating deceptive lists of endorsers and then they use this to manipulate other groups to sign on. A critical mass develops behind their event, which ends up being big enough to give the IAC the credibility that it is really interested in. As one activist recently explained:

"The IAC made a point of contacting many groups to sign on to International ANSWER. They immediately contacted various groups in the New York area for support and got it. They got folks as individuals to sign on and listing their organization (for informational purposes) which gives the illusion that those groups were for ANSWER even if those groups hadn't had time to even make a decision yet. They were willing to have anyone sign on, no litmus test of political principles required. Pacifists groups like the Jonah Catholic Worker House in Baltimore, or WWP's ideological rivals in the Freedom Road Socialist Party. For each name they got added to their list of endorsers, that gave them more clout as being the first big demonstration against the war."

The WWP is an authoritarian organization. Decisions about when and demos are going to be held are made by a small group of leaders. The WWP expects endorsing groups to participate under the banner of one of its front organizations, frequently the International Action Center and currently through the International A.N.S.W.E.R. coalition. This goes clearly against the non-hierarchical and democratic organizing models that have characterized the anti-globalization and anti-capitalist movements. There is no spokescouncil in the IAC.

The IAC is also known for the timidity of its protests, which are typically permitted, symbolic affairs that involve endless hours of speakers and a permitted march. The IAC actively discourages all forms of direct action, including civil disobedience. The IAC

actively participates and cooperates with the police at all stages of protest organizing. One of their frequent tactics is to take out permits for all the public spaces that other protest groups might be using for a large mass action. They then play "permit broker" in order to gain influence among other protestors.

WWP Front Groups

- International Action Center (<http://www.iacenter.org/>)
- International A.N.S.W.E.R. (<http://www.internationalanswer.org/>)
- Mumia 2000 (<http://www.mumia2000.org/>)
- Iraq Sanctions Challenge
- Beat Back Bush (www.beatbackbush.org)
- Peoples Video Network (<http://www.peoplesvideo.org/>)

Anecdotes from Activists

FAQ on the Workers World Party, International Action Center, and A.N.S.W.E.R.

Version 1.3 / August 15, 2007

Basics

Who is the Workers World Party?

Workers World Party: The Workers World Party was founded by Sam Marcy in 1959 when he left the Socialist Workers Party. Over time, Marcy's political ideology had warped from Trotskyism to an unusual form of Stalinism. The WWP claimed that it supported the rights of workers, but supported the overthrow of workers by the Soviet Union in places like Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. The Workers World Party nominated its first candidate for office in 1980. Though the WWP is small, its membership is highly dedicated and can accomplish much. In 1996, the WWP

succeeded in capturing a ballot spot in California which led to WWP Presidential candidate Monica Moorehead getting over 29,000 votes (mainly from California) in 1996. Moorehead once again ran for President in 2000 under the WWP ballot, but this time received less than 5,000 votes. The WWP has created a number of front organizations, including the International Action Center (which has been involved in the anti-globalization demonstrations) and the newly-formed ANSWER (an anti-war group). On May 10, FBI Director Louis Freeh named the WWP as a "domestic terrorist group" without providing any evidence, paving the way for future attacks on civil liberties on groups for merely having different opinions than the mainstream. This has brought sympathy from many leftists toward the WWP. However, the WWP continues to do things which will turn leftists away from them, including backing the Kimist dictators of North Korea and supporting the efforts of the anti-Semitic, chauvinistic Russian Communist Workers Party (RKRK). Overall, Workers World is one of the most authoritarian groups on the Left today. See the number of votes the WWP received in Presidential elections.

"American Red Groups"

<http://www.red-encyclopedia.org/groups.html>

What are the WWP's front groups?

A "front" group is any group or organization which is created by a parent group, which subsequently hides its involvement with the front group. The reasons for creating front groups vary. Right wing political groups frequently create fake environmental organizations. In the case of the Workers World Party, they create front groups because they understand that their politics alienates many working people. It's easy to get involved with a benign group called "the International Action Center," which people don't associate with the Stalinist politics of the WWP. However, the IAC's ties to the WWP have become widely exposed, which perhaps explains why the WWP/IAC people created the A.N.S.W.E.R. anti-war coalition.

The Worker's World Party is responsible for the following front groups: the

International Action Center, A.N.S.W.E.R. anti-war coalition, Mumia 2000, Iraq Sanctions Challenge, National Peoples Campaign and the People's Video Network.

What evidence do you have that A.N.S.W.E.R. is a front group for the WWP?

Given that authoritarian sectarian groups tend to stay with the tactics that work for them, it's quite simple to trace the connections between the WWP and A.N.S.W.E.R. Sometimes this is as easy as looking at which groups and individuals are involved when a group starts. Another easy method is to look at who speaks to the media at A.N.S.W.E.R. press conferences. In the case of A.N.S.W.E.R., WWP member Brian Becker is frequently the spokesperson for A.N.S.W.E.R. at press conferences and in media interviews. The beauty of front groups is that they can establish media credibility for a leader who can hide their links with the more politically problematic parent group. You can also look at who speaks at A.N.S.W.E.R. sponsored events: you will find activists such as Larry Holmes, Ramsey Clark, and Leslie Feinberg who all identify themselves as being part of front groups run by the WWP. Feinberg has identified herself as being a member of the IAC, when in reality she is the editor of Workers World, the newspaper of the WWP.

Another method of tracing these connections is to look at the addresses listed on websites and literature published by the front groups. For example, A.N.S.W.E.R. recently created the VoteNoWar.org campaign, which lists as an address where checks can be sent an address that corresponds to an existing WWP fundraising front group.

January 2005 update: Despite some evidence in 2004 that independent activists within A.N.S.W.E.R. had kicked out WWP members, recent newspaper articles about upcoming protests indicate that prominent WWP members such as Brian Becker are still leading the A.N.S.W.E.R. "coalition."

Responding to the Critics

What is your take on the recent criticisms leveled against the WWP and

ANSWER by Christopher Hitchens, Marc Cooper, Todd Gitlin, and David Corn?

It shouldn't surprise any veteran activist that Left writers are finally writing critically about the WWP and ANSWER. To a great extent, this kind of open criticism should be commonplace on the Left, but the extent to which leftists have knee-jerked to the critics shows something about the authoritarian head-in-the-sand thinking practiced by some activists. Much of what these writers have written is on target, but the fact that these writers engage in some cheap shots should not blind people to the fact that many activists are critical of the WWP and ANSWER's role in social change movements. Don't dismiss the message because the messengers are imperfect.

But didn't these writers engage in red-baiting when they suggested that having communists at a rally was a bad thing?

Yes, in fact, this was red-baiting. But this isn't as simple as it sounds, because people on the Left who seek to avoid public discussion of these issues at all costs will frequently accuse ANY critic of red-baiting. A democratic movement (or movements) should have room for internal critics and gadflies. However, several of these writers went beyond criticisms of the WWP and engaged in hysterical warnings about the presence of communists at anti-war rallies. There is nothing wrong with having communists, socialist, radicals, and ultra-leftists at rallies. What IS important to question is the existence of problematic groups and individuals at our events. Do we want to let ANSWER lead the movement, when it is a front group for an authoritarian organization whose practices are incompatible with movement values such as participatory democracy?

Has the WWP or ANSWER leadership responded to any of these criticisms?

No, of course not. These are authoritarians that we are talking about. They aren't interested in democracy and discussion. Have you ever been to an ANSWER spokescouncil led by Brian Becker? Of course not, that isn't how they operate. Not only

do they refuse to debate their critics, but they dispatch their friends and supporters to do the dirty work of responding for them. To the best of our knowledge, neither the WWP or A.N.S.W.E.R. have responded publicly to criticism levied against the group by grassroots activists. A.N.S.W.E.R. did respond publicly when they were criticized publicly by prominent leftists such as Rabbi Michael Lerner.

How else has the WWP and A.N.S.W.E.R. undermined the work of other activists?

It's very ironic that members of the WWP and A.N.S.W.E.R. have complained publicly that their right wing critics are red-baiting and bad-jacketing them, when they do similar things to rank-and-file activists. It has been established that WWP and A.N.S.W.E.R. cadre members have spread rumors about other activists. It was recently reported to us that at least one WWP member was telling new members that "anarchists work for the CIA." In another case, lawyers associated with A.N.S.W.E.R. spread rumors in radical lawyer circles that the webmaster of this website was working for the police. It's very probable that this is just the tip of the iceberg. An authoritarian group such as A.N.S.W.E.R. often falls victim to the worst excesses of paranoia and sectarianism.

Practices

Does the IAC take credit for the work of other activists?

Of course. This is a common tactic among left sects which don't enjoy the support of a mass base of grassroots support. Like other parasitical sects, the IAC has a history of taking credit for the hard work of other activists. Sometimes this is as simple as holding up several IAC signs at a demo and then claiming in the party newspaper that the IAC was involved in organizing the demonstration. (This is a common practice by sectarian groups--another favorite is to stage a picture with young activists running, i.e. "charging forward for socialism.") Activists in the anti-globalization movement are upset at the IAC for organizing a competing rally during the September 2001 Washington, DC protests. Their actions can be seen in this [press release](#), which presented the IAC as a

significant player in the anti-globalization movement. This is, of course, false.

Is the WWP and IAC dishonest to its supporters?

Yes. Many of the activists and working people who support the WWP and its front groups are unaware of the full history and politics of the organization. The WWP uses its front groups and a concerted strategy of "famous" endorsements to create the illusion that they are a mass-supported organization. There is a reason why Ramsey Clark, Ed Asner, and a slate of person of color groups are highlighted in WWP/iAC communications, newspapers, and websites. The WWP is very concerned with maintaining activist credibility. They want to be seen as THE organizer of big protests. This is clear in their recent efforts to organize their own parallel protests to the World Economic Forum protests in New York City. They've repeated what they did in 2001, by organizing their own event, not joining with other groups, and then claiming that they are the organizers for all the protests. If the IAC is so interested in working with other groups, why did it decide not to join any of the coalitions that were organizing anti-World Bank protests? Dozens, if not hundreds, of other groups joined these other coalitions. Why? Because the WWP, through its front groups, is pursuing the same strategy that vanguardist left groups have engaged in for the past century. They are interested in one thing: ownership of dissent and protest. In a sad way, they are like the globalizing corporations that millions of people oppose. The IAC represents the **monoculture** of protest.

What's up with A.N.S.W.E.R.'s frequent court fights?

You've probably heard about A.N.S.W.E.R. because of some news story covering the organization's attempts to get protest permits. In fact, A.N.S.W.E.R. is really not interested in getting parade permits. A.N.S.W.E.R. applies for parade and protest permits in hopes that the police will deny them, thus giving A.N.S.W.E.R.'s lawyers an opportunity to go to court against the police. A.N.S.W.E.R. uses this strategy simply to get publicity in hopes of establishing themselves as the "leader" of any protest that happens. This is really just a cheap, dishonest form of vanguardism, but it works because

it plays to predictable behaviors of the cops and the media when it comes to protesters. A.N.S.W.E.R. usually uses this strategy successfully in Washington, DC, although it failed them before the 2004 protests against the RNC in New York City. A.N.S.W.E.R. is not interested in civil liberties or obtaining permission to protest. The permit strategy is just a publicity stunt that A.N.S.W.E.R. uses over and over and over. Besides, you don't need a permit to exercise your free speech rights.

GETTING THE FACTS WRONG

How many people were really at the October 2002 protests in Washington, DC?

That's a good question, since making estimates of big crowds is difficult. If you are familiar with events organized by the WWP/IAC/ANSWER and have seen their estimates afterwards, you'll notice that they create rosy estimates that go above and beyond the usual activist practice of rounding up numbers.

In the case of the September 26, 2000 protests in Washington, DC, you heard crowd estimates that ranged from several thousand to 200,000. ANSWER seems to be sticking with the 200,000 number, so you can take that with a grain of salt. Local activists with more experience with Washington protests generally consensed on an attendance figure of around 100,000. One local activist said that the word on the street was that the attendance was between 80,000 and 120,000. A very respectable turnout, but nowhere near the 200,000 number promoted by ANSWER.

Did the Anti-Capitalist Convergence march on 9.29.01 join up with the IAC/ANSWER rally?

No. There never was any plan to join the ANSWER rally on 9.29.2001. The activists in the ACC were very insistent on doing our own, non-permitted rally and march. This was successful and drew over 2000 participants. As the march was breaking up at a park across the street from the World Bank, the police surrounding a large group of people

and held them for several hours. Eventually the cops forced this group to march to Freedom Plaza where the ANSWER/IAC rally had been going on for several hours. In fact, many of the anti-capitalists in this group thought they were being marched to arrest buses and there were several attempts to break through the police lines. When this group got to the ANSWER rally, some people stayed for the rally and march, but many left as soon as the cops allowed them to disperse. In typical fashion, the IAC is now claiming that they were the umbrella group that organized all of the anti-war protests in Washington that happened that day. This of course, is a fantasy.

Bigger issues

Why is the IAC dangerous to the anti-globalization movements?

Quite simply, the IAC represents the centralized, authoritarian mode of political dissent that is ineffective and is easy to control by our class enemies. The anti-globalization movements is really a convergence of movements and organizations. It is very decentralized, diverse, egalitarian, and democratic. It doesn't provide a monocultural face to power, which is why the other side has had so many difficulties in oppressing it. On the other hand, the IAC represents the discredited Old Left, which attempts to "unify" all resistance elements into one party, which is controlled of course by their "leading cadres," i.e. central committee. Most Old Left groups scare away new recruits because they don't conceal their politics very well, i.e. support for Mao or Stalin. The WWP and IAC are much better at eliminating politics from their work, their goal being control over all dissent.

Why is the WWP's support for Third World dictators so problematic?

The most visible manifestation of the WWP's cozy relationship to Third World dictators is the IAC leader Ramsey Clark. Clark is a former U.S. Attorney General who still practices law on behalf of undesirable clients. While this legal work is in itself admirable, the association of Ramsey Clark with organizations such as A.N.S.W.E.R. have made it easy for critics of the anti-war movements to throw mud and smears at the movements.

In December 2004, there was news that Clark is planning to help with the legal defense for Saddam Hussein. If this happens, it will further undermine the credibility of the anti-war movements.

The Workers World Party is widely known to support regimes such as Kim Il Jong in North Korea. WWP leaders make yearly trips to North Korea. The WWP newspaper has printed numerous articles that support Third World dictators.

Other criticism of ANSWER

Leslie Cagan on ANSWER and March 20th

Many activists in the New York area are confused as to who exactly is behind the March 20 demonstration which has been called to mark the first year since the bombs started falling on Iraq. Initially, word went out that United for Peace & Justice (UFPJ), the broad-based coalition behind last year's historic February 15 mobilization, had issued the call for March 20. Then International ANSWER--a group with which UFPJ has had a frequently contentious history--began issuing a call for a demonstration the same day. An entity called the March 20 National Coalition began distributing leaflets for the march with all ANSWER's contact info--and only their contact info. The list of endorsers leads with ANSWER, and UFPJ is nowhere in sight.

TOWARD A MAXIMUM ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT

Are you outraged with the US government's arrogant practice of policing the rest of the world, yet are you leery of having your outrage exploited by obsolete Leftists for their own bankrupt agendas? Are you pissed off that the US military is once again bullying tiny Third World countries and preparing to slaughter innocent civilians, yet are you hesitant to give any credibility to the Paleolithic Left's claims to leading a mass anti-war movement? Are you disgusted with America's imperial business-as-usual, yet are you also bored to tears with the Left's protest-politics-as-usual? There's a simple, do-it-yourself alternative that effectively challenges the US government's military adventurism while denying the fossilized Left its organizing and leadership pretensions. This strategy is based on the idea that thousands of grains of sand can cause even the largest, most

powerful machine to grind to a halt by becoming wedged in the gears and stuck between sensitive parts to gum up the works. The goal of this alternative strategy is to put our anti-war activism and movement to maximum effect.

WHAT'S LEFT? July 2002 by Lefty Hooligan

Thanks to the '60's, I never considered punk inherently anarchistic or revolutionary. Anarchic clearly, but not anarchistic by nature. Yes, there are anarchistic elements to punk rock, and I certainly exploited them in publishing two anarcho-punk 'zines-Point-Blank and San Diego's Daily Impulse-but I never pushed the line that punk is basically anarchistic, or leftist, or revolutionary.

Strange Marchfellows

The students' fears about ANSWER turned out to have been well founded. "I'll make a deal with you," said an ANSWER organizer at the Capitol rally to Terra Lawson-Remer of Students Transforming and Resisting Corporations (STARC), who was coordinating media outreach for the NSYPC event. "We won't play the Mumia tape again"--ANSWER had already broadcast a taped speech by Mumia at the Ellipse--"if you'll tell the press we had 150,000 people here." Lawson-Remer was in a bind; she didn't want them to carry out this threat, but she believed the turnout was in the 50,000 to 75,000 range. The ANSWER organizers pressed the point, arguing that whatever they said, the media would report fewer. This was not a difference of opinion about the truth. "It's not about accuracy. It's about politics. It's not about counting," said ANSWER's Tony Murphy condescendingly. "It's us against them. [The pro-Israel] demonstrators had 100,000 here last week." (Responding to a web version of this article, ANSWER's legal counsel called this account a "disgusting fabrication," but I can attest to its accuracy because I was there.)

WHAT'S LEFT? April 2002 by Lefty Hooligan

That Leninoid fucks like the Workers World Party on a national level and the International Socialist Organization on the student level are strangling the anti-war movement is the bad news. The good news is that the anti-globalization movement

appears to be alive and well, if the protests against the World Economic Forum in NYC and Brazil (and in Munich against NATO) at the beginning of February 2002 are any indication. I could spend many more column inches praising the anti-WEF actions, noting the restraint of the Black Bloc, and generally applauding this modest return of anti-capitalist activism after 9/11.

WHAT'S LEFT? March 2002 by Lefty Hooligan

Kevin Coogan has recently written a scathing exposé of Ramsey Clark's crackpot politics and the Workers World Party's "weirdly messianic ideology" which "combined the worst aspects of Trotskyism, Maoism, and Stalinism into a unique and utterly foul brew."

WHAT'S LEFT? December 2001 by Lefty Hooligan

I didn't make it to Washington DC for the cancelled anti-IMF/World Bank demonstrations, or to New York for my vacation because of mass murder on September 11. New York wouldn't have been much of a vacation, and my girlfriend wasn't into flying across the country. That's how I wound up attending the SF demo. Initiated by the International Action Center, a front for the neo-Stalinoid Workers World Party as well as the organization behind the International Answer coalition, the September 29 rally was endorsed by the usual suspects, among them liberal-left "fair trade" advocates like Global Exchange. Workers World scumfucks like Gloria La Riva justify the Soviet invasions of Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968 and Afghanistan in 1980; support the Chinese government's 1989 suppression of the Tienanmen Square protests and the 1991 coup against Gorbachev; and laud North Korea as a workers' paradise.

Opposition to War and Racism Has to be Big, not Small

After the heinous massacre of innocent people Tuesday, September 11, Bush and the right wing – with the collaboration of Democrats and the silence of the liberals – are trying to manipulate public opinion to entangle the country in a war of revenge that will not only fail to solve the question of terrorism, but will aggravate it. In fact, it has

already created a wave of violence and racism against US Arabs and Muslims.

The International Action Center: "Peace Activists" with a Secret Agenda?

On September 29th, 2001, just a few weeks following the September 11th terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, a large peace rally was held in Washington, D.C., to oppose an American military response to the attack. The main organizer of the D.C. rally, ANSWER (Act Now to Stop War & End Racism), was officially established shortly after the 9/11 attack. The leading force behind ANSWER's creation is the International Action Center (IAC), which represents itself as a progressive organization devoted to peace, justice, and human rights issues.

"Lefty" Hooligan -- What's Left?

The good news is that troglodyte Trot Sam Marcy died recently. The bad news is that his thuggish spawn, the Workers World Party, continues to muscle for the leadership of national antiwar sentiment. As you might have remembered, the WWP loves to organize through front formations—All-People's Congress, National People's Campaign, International Action Center (IAC).

The WWP - the Leftover Left

The Workers World Party's style of organizing—lots of superficially independent, fake popular/united front type organizations calling and running a demo—described last issue can be contrasted with the approach taken by the December 6 Mobilization to Free Mumia Abu-Jamal. Your typical lowest-common-denominator-to-get-the-broadest-possible-support leftist coalition, I'll refer to it as the D6M from now on.

/font>

The Mysterious Ramsey Clark

Take a close look and there is something downright suspicious about former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, now the darling of certain sectors of the radical left. His journey has taken him from the heights of federal power to outer orbits of the political fringe. In the process, he has seemingly transformed from a shill for the most corrupt elements of the US elites to a shill for any foreign despot who claims to oppose the US

elites. Who is Ramsey Clark really working for?

Opinion of Former Attorney General

I'll assume that most people have never heard much about Ramsey Clark, since he's hardly a household name. The short version is that he's a dupe of a bunch of Stalinists who spends much of his time these days working on behalf of suspected war criminals. The detail below is probably overkill, but it's important to know just how "out there" this guy is.

ENLARGE

Gloria La Riva is one of the leading cadre of the so-called "Workers World Party," a.k.a. the "International Action Center" and the "All-People's Congress." Their politics are a hybrid of Stalinism and Trotskyism. She and her comrade goons act as unpaid police auxiliaries at large demonstrations and try to prevent unruly activity from taking place. We put these posters up in the fall of 1994, when La Riva was running for Governor of California.

The worst thing you can say about most leftists is to attribute to them the opinions they actually hold.

[More posters from the Class War Poster Campaigns in San Francisco](#)

Additional readings

[More background on IAC/WWP activity in the Bay Area](#)

LaRiva's handcuffs-and-nightstick Leftism is also evident in her unapologetic support

Send a Leftist cop to the Hall of Justice!



**GLORIA
LA RIVA
FOR
SHERIFF OF
SAN
FRANCISCO!**

Gloria Estela La Riva is a fighting militant of the Workers World Party. You've probably seen us in action at major demonstrations — providing leadership by having the loudest loudspeaker system, and aiding the Tac Squad in weeding out undisciplined protesters. From San Francisco to Washington D.C., in big city demonstrations coast-to-coast, the Workers World Party has taken responsibility as unpaid police auxiliaries. We've been there—and we know how to get the job done!

Extremists and provocateurs claim that socialism means rule by social workers, but we say it means rule by police and social workers!

Throughout the 20th century, all progressive peoples have fought for compulsory labor for the poor— **JOBS ARE A RIGHT!**

Capitalists call for police for the few — we call for police for the many!

Our leftist politics are those of Ceausescu and Castro, Kim-Il-Sung and Lavrenti Beria — A pantheon of glory! We supported the massacre in Tienanmen Square and the repression of social unrest in Poland in 1981.

Throughout the twentieth century, people like Gloria have used socialist and populist jargon to extend the domination of wage labor everywhere. We can do the same here!

It's time to recognize the historically progressive social function of the left — We know how to police the working class.

Give Gloria a shot at the job! Police Before Profits!

PARTIAL LIST OF EMPLOYERS:
Supervisor Janice Hallinan, Supervisor George Midgett, Reverend Cecil Williams, Guide Memorial Church and former advisor to the San Francisco Police Department, Offices for Justice, Communist Party of Albania (retired), Freedom Socialist Party, Democratic Socialists of America, CP-USA, PD-USA, Social Workers Party, Renee French, League of Counter-Revolutionary Struggle, Goddess Club USA, Communist Party (Karlshof-Leninist), Knights Templar, Paul D'Amico, Reorganized Basic Workers Movement USA, AFL-CIO Local 955, Working Family Health Trust.

for Saddam Hussein's brutality. This goes well beyond Mao's dictum that "the enemy of my enemy is my friend." I'm no flag-waving US patriot by any means, but I don't automatically assume that those who oppose US military aggression are on my side. It's important to remember Iraq's recent history in particular. Two-thirds of the country rose up in armed rebellion against Hussein's dictatorial Ba'athist regime at the end of the Gulf War, with soldier's deserting the Iraqi army in droves and with insurrectionary workers, peasants and soldiers establishing autonomous shuras (councils) in major southern and northern Iraqi cities. Hussein's elite Republican Guard, spared during the Gulf War, managed to smash these revolts. LaRiva no doubt approved of these Iraqi government actions given the WWP's history of support for crushing independent workers' councils, from Lenin's and Trotsky's own justification for Bolshevizing the Russian soviets to Sam Marcy's "paleo-Leninist banalities" in defence of the Soviet invasion of Hungary.

How does the IAC collaborate with the police?

"They're always very peaceful; you can work with them," [Police Chief] Ramsey said of International ANSWER demonstrators. "They just want to come in and protest. They don't want to cause any damage." [Washington Post, October 21, 2002]

"They're always very peaceful; you can work with them," [Police Chief] Ramsey said of International ANSWER demonstrators. "They just want to come in and protest. They don't want to cause any damage." [Washington Post, October 21, 2002]

There They Go Again!

One of the annoying things that the International Action Center does is to take credit for protests organized by other organizations and coalitions. Their anti-war front group, A.N.S.W.E.R., was recently caught [lying](#) about their involvement in the April 5th, pro-Palestine protests in New York City. Their website features an [article](#) that suggests that A.N.S.W.E.R. organized this protest of 10,000 people. In reality, A.N.S.W.E.R. held a small protest in Times Square and later joined the bigger protest. The picture on this

webpage also suggests that A.N.S.W.E.R. was the main organizers. This is a typical tactic among sectarian left party groups. They will go to a bigger demo and arrange a few cadre members to pose with a sign in front of (or the middle of) a crowd. The signs have the name of the organization and they use these photos in their newspapers to lie to readers about their involvement in the protest.

What's up with ANSWER and the A20 protests?

ANSWER has been spreading false information that they reached a "unity" agreement with the other A20 groups. ANSWER is promoting a "united front" for the weekend of protests. The problem with their united front nonsense is that the other groups and local activists want nothing to do with ANSWER (and the WWP/IAC), because, once again ANSWER is trying to publicly deceive people that they are the primary organizers of the A20 protests. ANSWER had originally scheduled protests for A27, but moved them when several big protests were scheduled for the weekend of A20. Worker's World, the party organ for the WWP, has gone so far as to further this deception by telling its readers that ANSWER is working hand-in-hand with the other A20 coalitions. There is no such cooperation, which shows again why ANSWER, the International Action Center, and the WWP, are not to be trusted by activists.