

Intercontinental Press

combined with **imprecor**

Vol. 19 No. 14

April 20, 1981

USA \$1

UK 40p

Irish Political Prisoner Elected to British Parliament

Mexican Revolutionists Fight for Ballot Rights



FRED MURPHY/IP
MEXICO CITY: 1,400 people rallied April 5 to support Revolutionary Workers Party (PRT) campaign to win ballot rights for 1982 elections. On speakers' platform, from left, striking coal miner David Ferguson, representing U.S. Socialist Workers Party; Peruvian revolutionist Hugo Blanco; Rosario Ibarra de Piedra, Mexico's leading human-rights fighter; and PRT leader Manuel Aguilar Mora.

**U.S. Socialists
Put Government
On Trial**

***Polish Revolution—
How It Developed,
Where It is Going***

NEWS ANALYSIS

El Salvador—Massacres and Cover-ups

By Fred Murphy

Reports have begun to come out of El Salvador and Honduras of another brutal massacre of Salvadoran refugees by troops of the Salvadoran and Honduran armies.

The reported death toll of some 1,500 exceeds even the 600 or more killed along the Río Sumpul in June 1980.

According to dispatches published in the Mexico City daily *El Día* on April 8 and 9, hundreds of Salvadoran peasants and their families, fleeing aerial bombardment, tried to take refuge in a cave near the Honduran border.

"Almost everybody hid in the La Sentada cave," a survivor was quoted as saying. "Then the Honduran and Salvadoran soldiers began firing and throwing smoke bombs. Children who ran out crying were cut down by bullets."

According to this account, the soldiers "sealed the cave and left all those inside to die of asphyxiation." The dead included some 150 children, 600 elderly persons, and 700 women.

In the Honduran capital of Tegucigalpa, the president of the Honduran Coordinating Committee of Solidarity With the Salvadoran People, Reynaldo Erazo, said "the bestial massacre" took place during the last weekend in March. Salvadoran troops and members of the right-wing paramilitary group ORDEN were involved, Erazo said. The solidarity group demanded "immediate explanations" from the Honduran government of its role in the killings.

The peasants were fleeing from an area of northern Morazán province where the Salvadoran armed forces had been carrying out "scorched earth" attacks for several weeks, using heavy artillery, helicopter gunships, and white phosphorus bombs in an effort to rout rebel forces of the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN).

A March 25 FMLN communiqué denounced the use of phosphorus bombs by the Salvadoran air force. "Extensive zones

of the provinces of Cuscatlán, Cabañas, Morazán, and Chalatenango have been the object of merciless enemy shelling, which have the defenseless civilian population as the principal target," the communiqué said.

As of April 13, none of the major U.S. news media had reported the army attacks on civilians or the accounts of the cave massacre, despite the wide publicity the latter have received in Mexico and Central America.

Another example of the terrorist methods of the Salvadoran armed forces has been reported in the United States, however. During the night of April 6-7, some twenty-eight persons were killed in the San Nicolás shantytown in southwestern San Salvador. The Salvadoran Defense Ministry claimed in an April 7 statement that the deaths were all the "result of a confrontation between an armed guerrilla band and treasury police."

But a different account quickly emerged. "Relatives of 22 of the victims said they were arrested by government security forces Sunday and Monday [April 5 and 6] in poor neighborhoods near San Nicolás," a summary of dispatches from San Salvador published in the April 8 Newark, New Jersey, *Star-Ledger* said. The summary continued:

"Journalists who went to the scene said 21 bodies, including five women, were scattered in a street. At least six were blindfolded and had their thumbs tied behind their backs. . . .

"The street where the victims were slain ran with blood and the victims, presumed to be leftists, were disfigured by large-caliber slugs pumped into their heads and chests. One young boy said he saw a masked man in civilian clothes pointing out homes from which victims were dragged."

The use of civilian informers to point out the homes of "presumed leftists" and the tying of prisoners' thumbs behind their backs are part of the standard operating procedure for the Salvadoran security forces.

It was undoubtedly no coincidence that the U.S. State Department chose the week of the Morazán massacre and the San Nicolás killings to launch charges that Salvadoran leftists had embarked on a "new strategy" of killing government officials. "Our analysts are close to reaching a formal conclusion that a concerted assassination effort aimed at Government officials is the new wrinkle," Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American

Affairs James Cheek told *New York Times* correspondent Judith Miller. The *Times* obligingly featured Cheek's statements on its front page April 9 and said nothing about the San Nicolás killings until the following day.

"Mr. Cheek and other officials said that while at least four attempts to assassinate President Duarte in the last month had failed, about six mayors, deputy mayors or district governors in the countryside had been killed," Miller reported.

But Cheek's charges conflicted directly with a dispatch from El Salvador by Al Kamen printed in the April 9 *Washington Post*. "The Christian Democrats [Duarte's party] hold government security forces, or right-wing paramilitary organizations, responsible for the murders of more than 40 Christian Democratic mayors and scores of party leaders and workers," Kamen reported.

The wide publicity given to the San Nicolás killings finally forced the Reagan administration to acknowledge that the Treasury Police might have been involved. Despite the Salvadoran Defense Ministry's own cover-up statement, however, Washington carefully sought to disassociate the Duarte government from the killings. The State Department even declared that "these most recent killings reinforce our determination to support the centrist government" of El Salvador!

But the massive quantities of arms and military equipment that Reagan has rushed to El Salvador are not going to Duarte and his "centrist" Christian Democrats, who are little more than figureheads. They are going to the Salvadoran armed forces, which are becoming more and more widely exposed as the chief perpetrators of violence against civilians.

That this is a conscious policy on the part of the Salvadoran high command and not—as the State Department would have it—the aberrations of out-of-control "extremists" was made clear in remarks by Defense Minister Col. José Guillermo García to the Salvadoran Chamber of Commerce on April 9. According to an account published in *El Día* of Mexico City April 10, "García promised that the Armed Forces will smash the rebel forces just as in 1932. . . .

"García indicated that the military had been justified in adopting energetic measures in response to the peasant revolt, commonly known as the Massacre of 1932."

Thirty thousand or more Indian peasants lost their lives in the bloodbath launched by the Salvadoran military and the landlords after the January 1932 uprising was put down. Since the beginning of 1980, according to Catholic Church figures, 19,000 Salvadorans have been killed or "disappeared." With their new U.S. hardware, García's troops are well on their way to topping the 1932 figure of their predecessors. □

Attention Foreign Airmail Subscribers:

Due to a 60-to-80-percent increase in U.S. airmail postage rates, we have decided to ship your subscription a more economical way. It will now be first air cargoed to Amsterdam, arriving every Thursday, and then mailed out from there. You can expect a three-to-five day delivery time from Amsterdam.

Washington Releases Letelier Killers

By Janice Lynn

Two Cuban counterrevolutionaries—convicted in 1979 by a U.S. jury for the 1976 murders of Orlando Letelier (former Chilean ambassador in the Allende government) and his associate Ronni Moffitt—were released from a Washington, D.C. jail April 9.

A U.S. court had overturned their convictions last September—just four days after Cuban United Nations diplomat Félix García Rodríguez had been gunned down by Cuban counterrevolutionaries in New York City.

Guillermo Novo Sampol and Alvin Ross Díaz were released after six right-wing Cuban businessmen put up \$400,000 bond. Novo and Ross are scheduled to again stand trial sometime in May.

The release of the two counterrevolutionaries comes in the context of Washington's stepped-up anti-Cuba campaign. It serves as a sign of encouragement to the exile groups in the United States in carrying out their terrorist attacks against Cuban citizens or other supporters of the Cuban revolution.

Counterrevolutionary Cuban groups have taken credit for three murders and numerous bombings over the past two years.

Recent reports have revealed that the CIA has stepped up its cooperation with the anti-Cuban groups. U.S. reporters confirmed the existence of training camps in Florida where Cuban and Nicaraguan exiles are training and practicing for counterrevolutionary invasions of these countries.

This fits in with the Reagan administration's concerted propaganda campaign to try to isolate Cuba throughout the world, accusing the Cuban government of supplying arms to the revolutionary forces in El Salvador. Washington labels the national liberation struggle of the Salvadoran people as just part of an international communist conspiracy led by Cuba.

With backing from Washington, the Colombian government broke diplomatic relations with Cuba, the Costa Rican government closed down its Havana consulate, and the Ecuadoran government has threatened to break relations.

Last September, following the example set by the U.S. imperialists in overturning the convictions of Novo and Ross, a Venezuelan military court similarly acquitted four terrorists who in 1976 had blown up a Cuban airliner off Barbados, killing seventy-three people.

All these provocations—orchestrated by Washington—are intended as a warning to Cuba to give up its internationalist stance in solidarity with the revolutionary strug-

gles in Central America and the Caribbean.

The April 9 release of the two terrorists also follows the U.S. State Department's February 20 announcement that it was lifting all trade sanctions that had been imposed against the Chilean dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet.

The sanctions had been imposed in 1979 following Pinochet's refusal to extradite three of his former secret police officers who had been indicted for planning the Letelier and Moffitt assassinations.

Accompanying Washington's overtures to Pinochet have been the Reagan administration's decision to embrace the Argen-

tine dictatorship and its continuous support to the murderous junta in El Salvador. These regimes have been responsible for the disappearances, murder, and torture of thousands of workers and peasants.

While proclaiming that there is no room for "international terrorism," Reagan is making it clear to the peoples of Latin America that in Washington's eyes there is some room after all for dictatorial, procapitalist regimes and counterrevolutionary terrorist groups.

Such policies help expose before working people throughout the world that it is in Washington where the real terrorists are to be found. □

In This Issue

Closing News Date: April 13, 1981

IRELAND	372	Political Prisoner Elected to British Parliament—by Gerry Foley
MEXICO	374	PRT Fights for Ballot Rights—by Fred Murphy
YUGOSLAVIA	376	Tanks Sent Into Rebellious Province—by Ernest Harsch
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	377	Mass Protests Against Visit of U.S. Warships—by Claudio Tavárez
POLAND	378	The Polish Revolution—How It Developed, Where It Is Going—by David Frankel
	383	Interview With Communist Party Leader
USA	384	High Stakes in Miners Strike—Statement of the SWP
	385	Socialist Suit—A Challenge to Government Spying—by Janice Lynn
	388	Court Testimony of SWP Leader Farrell Dobbs
NICARAGUA	391	How Sandinistas Won Over the Farmers—by Matilde Zimmermann
	400	"Bread for Nicaragua" Campaign Launched—by Fernando Torres
HONDURAS	394	Honduras Feels Winds of Central American Upsurge—by Lars Palmgren
	395	Unionists Rally for El Salvador—by Lars Palmgren
DOCUMENTS	396	War and the New Stage of the Iranian Revolution—Resolution of the HVK
NEWS ANALYSIS	370	El Salvador—Massacres and Cover-ups—by Fred Murphy
	371	Washington Releases Letelier Killers—by Janice Lynn

Intercontinental Press (ISSN 0162-5594). Intercontinental Press, 410 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014. Published in New York each Monday except the first in January and the third and fourth in August.

Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y.

Editor: Mary-Alice Waters.
Contributing Editors: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

Managing Editor: Steve Clark.
Editorial Staff: David Frankel, Ernest Harsch, Janice Lynn, Fred Murphy, Will Reissner.

Business Manager: Sandi Sherman
Copy Editor: David Martin.

Intercontinental Press specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, Black, and women's liberation movements.

Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion, unsigned

material stands on the program of the Fourth International.

To Subscribe: For one-year subscriptions in the U.S. or Canada send \$35.00 (41.00 Canadian dollars) to Intercontinental Press, 410 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014. Write for rates for first class and airmail.

For air-speeded subscriptions to Australia: Write to Pathfinder Press, P.O. Box K208, Haymarket 2000. In New Zealand: Write to Socialist Books, P.O. Box 3774, Auckland.

For airmail subscriptions to Britain, Ireland, and continental Europe send \$50 for one year; \$25 for six months. Write for subscription rates to all other countries.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, 410 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014.

Please allow five weeks for change of address. Include your old address, and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Intercontinental Press is published by the 408 Printing and Publishing Corporation, 408 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014. Offices at 408 West Street, New York, N.Y.

Irish Political Prisoner Elected to British Parliament

By Gerry Foley

The Irish liberation movement scored a major victory April 10 when Bobby Sands, a twenty-seven-year-old political prisoner, was elected to the British Parliament.

British officials, who had prevented Sands from presenting his views during the election campaign, also refused to allow him to comment on his victory.

But as Danny Morrison, one of the organizers of Sands's campaign, put it: "This has finally proved through the ballot box how deep the support is for the republican prisoners. The people have spoken on behalf of the Irish nation."

Sands received 30,492 votes in the by-election, held in the rural Fermanagh/South Tyrone constituency in the southwest corner of Northern Ireland. His opponent, Harry West, a proimpe-

rialist Protestant (Unionist) politician, got 29,046 votes.

One of the most important aspects of Sands's victory is that it will help focus international attention on the conditions of Irish political prisoners in the H-Block of Long Kesh Prison and the Armagh jail for women.

As the elected camp commander of the republican prisoners in H-Block, Sands, a member of the Provisional Irish Republican Army (IRA), negotiated with the authorities during a fifty-three-day hunger strike that ended December 18. However, the British reneged on the agreements made at that time, and as a result Sands initiated a new hunger strike on March 1. He had already gone forty-one days without food when his election was announced on April 10.

ENNISKILLEN, Northern Ireland—Since the morning—as the votes were being counted here in the Fermanagh/South Tyrone by-election—a victory for H-Block hunger striker Bobby Sands had been looking more and more likely.

The vote was extraordinarily high. The pro-British Unionists admitted openly that they had been relying on a low poll. It was obvious that the expected abstention by the "moderate" Catholics had not materialized. There were few spoiled ballots, and most of them appeared to be protest votes against the official Unionist candidate, by more extreme Unionists. The official Unionist spokesperson began to talk about the possibility of a "serious setback to community relations," that is, between the Catholic and Protestant communities.

I began to hear shouts and chanting. I went out of the counting office, down a long outside staircase to the courtyard, passing through a line of heavily armed police. Several hundred persons had gathered behind the banner of the Enniskillen H-Block Youth Committee. They were chanting the favorite slogan of the mass demonstrations in support of the Irish political prisoners. "One, two, three, four, open up the H-Block door. Five, six, seven, eight, open up the Armagh gate."

'Victory to the Prisoners'

Then, one of the Sands campaign observers at the count came rushing down the stairs to meet the crowd. A huge cheer went up. The crowd began to shout for the

Sands campaign manager, Owen Carron. He came down and said, partly in the Irish language, "Ladies and gentlemen, friends, I would like to claim victory on behalf of Bobby Sands. Victory to the prisoners in H-Block and Armagh!"

Carron went on to say that the nationalist population had given a clear message: "It's time for the British to do what they always should have done—get out."

But the victory was expressed more powerfully by the quiet speeches of Bobby Sands's mother and sister than by the triumphant shouting and singing. Throughout the campaign, Mrs. Sands, had not spoken. Audiences were always told that she did not feel up to it. Now, for the first time, she spoke in a calm voice to thank the campaign workers and voters. That was the measure of the hope that the victory had given her.

The crowd began a celebration that I was told would go on all night.

I left for Coalisland where there was to be a victory rally at 9:00 p.m. As we drove in, the streets of the small town were lined with thousands of people. The local band was out playing, "The Broad Black Brimmer of the IRA." Behind it, youths were waving huge tricolors. The flag of the Dublin insurrection seemed once again to be lifted on the wings of history.

I could see the flames of a large bonfire that had been lit outside the high wire fence surrounding the police barracks. The band went on to play "Roddy McCorley," a song about an insurgent hanging by the British almost two centuries ago. It is also

the tune of the ballad of Seán South, an IRA guerrilla killed during the 1956-61 campaign in a town in the Fermanagh/South Tyrone area.

Bernadette Devlin McAliskey: Chief Campaigner

As in Enniskillen, the first person the crowd called for was the person who ran the local campaign offices. Then more and more insistent calls went up for Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, who was seen as the central organizer and spokesperson of the campaign. Although she is only a few weeks out of the hospital following the January assassination attempt on her, she worked twelve hours a day, giving interviews to the press, advising campaign workers on the details of the law, and helping to address and stuff envelopes.

Bernadette told the people that they had demonstrated their political understanding and their strength. She repeated a local saying that she had used over and over again during the campaign, "We are not backward here in the country. It's not that we are slow; we just walk easy."

In fact, it is ironic that through this election an area such as Fermanagh in particular could take the lead in the second hunger strike campaign, although it was one of the weakest in the first. For the first time in many decades, real political momentum has been generated in this area, and this has set in motion forces throughout the country.

Political prisoners have been run in election campaigns in the past in Ireland as a means of highlighting their cases. But there could hardly have been a more dramatic campaign.

This campaign offered an unexpected opportunity to draw attention to the plight of the H-Block prisoners and to demonstrate the opposition of the nationalist population to the attempts of the British government to force the prisoners to accept criminal status.

Sands's campaign was carefully organized. Campaign workers were taught to expect all kinds of skulduggery—impersonation of voters, intimidation, the stealing of ballots, and the various tricks used by polling clerks to invalidate the ballots of nationalist voters.

The only way you can win an election under such conditions is to out-mobilize and out-organize your opponent. But if you can win it, you have shown that you can win more deepgoing struggles than electoral contests.

The enthusiasm of the young people in particular for the campaign was obvious. As I drove into Dungannon for a campaign meeting on April 2, there were swarms of youngsters plastering the abandoned buildings, fences, walls, and telephone poles in the town. The whole area was covered with Sands's posters.

In fact, in Belleek, one of the smallest and most remote of the Fermanagh towns, the Sands campaign was carried out only by six workers at the local pottery. They began working only a few days before the election, but managed to bring out almost every nationalist voter to the polls for Sands. They were by no means republicans, much less supporters of the Provisionals.

The campaign got the support of all generations of the Catholic population. In every locality, experienced election workers, respected and mature people, came forward to take on the tasks involved in running a Northern Ireland election campaign.

The complicated election procedures had to be taught and learned quickly, since many of the campaign workers were republicans who have traditionally boycotted elections.

The republicans made an important turn in resorting to the tactic of using elections. Running election campaigns for prisoners is part of the republican tradition, but in their recent attempts to defend the abstentionist position republicans have maintained toward parliamentary elections since the partition of Ireland, the republicans have tended to make nonparticipation in elections into an absolute principle. In this case, the advantages of the electoral tactic were simply too great to be let slip.

Sands's candidacy had one immediate beneficial impact. Journalists began to demand access to him and thereby to challenge the isolation of the Long Kesh prisoners from outside observers.

The British National Union of Journalists passed a resolution April 2 calling for Sands to have the same access to the press as other candidates. The union conference

also voted a resolution commending the journalists who have helped to expose the conditions suffered by the men in the H-Block and the women in Armagh jail.

Single Nationalist Candidate

The fact that Sands emerged as the only nationalist candidate against the Unionist Harry West, was an indication of the extent of the sympathy of the nationalist population for the prisoners.

A number of nationalist candidates felt obliged to withdraw in Sands's favor. Noel Maguire, the brother of the deceased member of Parliament for the district, had announced his determination to stand. This seat had been held by the Maguire family for generations and was regarded as their fief.

Furthermore, the local hierarchy urged Maguire to stand in order to block a candidacy by Bernadette McAliskey. The Social Democratic and Labour Party (SDLP) was also anxious to contest the seat in order to maintain its credibility as the conciliationist Catholic party.

But Bernadette McAliskey withdrew her candidacy, as did Maguire at the last minute. The SDLP also withdrew, but with public bad grace and mutual recrimination among various factions of the party. Some leaders of this very electoralist party resorted to calling on voters to spoil their ballots rather than vote for Sands.

The implications and impact of the campaign were indicated by the fact that two major southern politicians were drawn into supporting the Sands campaign, the Donegal political boss Neil Blaney and Sily De Valera, a representative of the De Valera dynasty in the ruling Fianna Fáil party.

The political counterattack of the bourgeois Irish politicians and the British press and politicians have centered on claims that the Sands victory represents nothing new, just the continuation of the traditional polarization between the nationalists and Unionists in Fermanagh/South Tyrone. That, however, leaves out of the picture both the reasons why Sands could become the agreed nationalist candi-

date and why the nationalists came out to vote in large numbers, when a low poll had been forecast.

In fact, nationalists have not historically considered having a Unionist MP as the greatest of all evils. The nationalist vote had split more than once before, even though this let in Unionists. The fact is that since nationalists in the north can get only one or two MPs at most out of a House of more than 600 members, many in the area think that having an MP is rather unimportant.

The campaign found, though, that people responded best to appeals to use their vote to strike a blow against British repression and for the unity and dignity of the Irish people.

In this area, with the massive military repression and a tradition of anti-Catholic murders, nationalists knew that they were taking a risk by voting for Sands. In fact, the campaign had been the subject of heavy harassment from the British army, the police, and the Protestant militia at every step.

As soon as it became clear that they were losing, Unionist leaders of all shades began warning that the vote was going to mean trouble. They claimed that the results meant that the Catholic population supported the murder of Protestant leaders and they issued a condemnation of the more than 90 percent of the Catholic voters who cast their ballots for Sands.

The truth is that although IRA spokespersons could have claimed that the vote represented popular support for their military campaign, they have stressed that they called only for a vote against the British attempt to break the nationalist movement and intimidate the nationalist population.

The fact that the Sands victory was followed immediately by a police assault on an H-Block demonstration in Belfast April 11 and the arrest of nine H-Block campaign leaders points to the dangers now facing the nationalist movement. What the Unionist rumbling about the "setback to community relations" means is that the oppressed Catholic population has stood up and that they must now be beaten down again.

In this situation, it is vital to move immediately to mobilize international public opinion in support of the democratic rights of the Irish people. The most immediate need is to raise an outcry against the British government's intention to invalidate the Sands election.

Such an attempt would make a mockery of the democratic rights of the majority of the population of Fermanagh/South Tyrone. It would show contempt for the undeniable feelings of the Irish people as a whole. And it would demonstrate a shameless disrespect for a man who by his suffering and sacrifice has won the support of the population of an electoral district far from his home area. □



March in support of hunger strikers in Twinbrook, West Belfast.

Mexican PRT Fights for Ballot Rights

By Fred Murphy

MEXICO CITY—Nearly 1,400 supporters of the Revolutionary Workers Party (PRT), Mexican section of the Fourth International, rallied here April 5 to demand that the López Portillo government grant the PRT ballot rights for the July 1982 federal elections.

Among the enthusiastic crowd were striking automobile workers, peasants and farm workers who had traveled through the night to arrive in the capital in time for the rally, shantytown dwellers who have been fighting government-ordered evictions, teachers and university workers, and dozens of activists from the Revolutionary Communist Youth (JCR), founded by young PRT members in 1980.

PRT leaders said afterwards that some two-thirds of those attending were not PRT members but were sympathizers or independent supporters of the party's ballot rights.

In addition to leaders of the PRT, the rally was addressed by Rosario Ibarra de Piedra, leader of the National Front Against Repression (FNCR) and a central figure in the movement against government repression in Mexico (see box).

The PRT has announced that if it gains ballot status, it will present Ibarra de Piedra as its candidate for president in 1982. The party has proposed to other parties and organizations on the left that an electoral bloc be formed in support of an Ibarra de Piedra candidacy. The central focus of such a campaign, the PRT says, would be the fight to halt repression and defend and extend democratic rights in Mexico.

International solidarity with the PRT's fight for legalization and ballot rights was voiced at the rally by striking coal miner David Ferguson, who represented the Socialist Workers Party of the United States; and by the well-known Peruvian revolutionist Hugo Blanco, who was elected last May to the Chamber of Deputies of the Peruvian Congress as a candidate of his party, also called the PRT.

Fight Began in 1977

The Mexican PRT has been fighting for full legalization and the right to present candidates in elections since 1977. At that time the López Portillo regime promulgated its Law on Political Organizations and Electoral Processes.

The new law made it somewhat easier for opposition political parties to become registered and gain ballot status. López

Portillo wanted to open a safety valve for the mounting discontent among workers, peasants, and students, and channel it into parliamentary activity—without, of course, weakening the longstanding monopoly on political power held by the government's Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI).

Taking advantage of the new law, the Revolutionary Workers Party collected the required 65,000 signatures of supporters in early 1978 and presented its request for legalization to the Federal Electoral Commission.

The commission acted favorably on similar requests from the Communist Party and other groups, but it refused to certify the PRT for ballot status in the July 1979 congressional elections. It did, however, recognize the PRT's legality as a "political association." The commission indicated that the question of ballot rights could be reconsidered if the PRT carried out activity for one year as a "political association."

After that 1978 ruling, the government continually stalled by simply refusing to reconvene the Federal Election Commis-

sion.

The PRT stepped up its efforts to gain ballot rights on March 12 of this year, joining with other groups in a rally outside the Ministry of the Interior. The demonstration demanded that the electoral commission be convened.

News conferences, statements, and further protests finally forced the government to call the commission into session on March 31. It formally reopened the registration process for both "political associations" and new groups seeking legalization for the first time.

The government has been put into a situation in which it will be difficult for it to justify the continued denial of ballot rights to the PRT. The party has clearly fulfilled the electoral law's requirements: submission of 65,000 signatures, activity as a "political association" for well over a year, and representation of a distinct position in the country's political spectrum.

The regime's reluctance to open the ballot to more parties has been evident in recent statements by electoral commission officials. "In Mexico's case, it is desirable that [parties] do not proliferate in such a way as to atomize or split up the political tendencies, thus increasing confusion instead of opposition," commission technical secretary Luis Dantón Rodríguez told the Mexico City daily *Uno más Uno* April 4.

"Interior Minister Olivares claims that holding rallies and demonstrations like this one is a waste of time," PRT leader

A Fighter for Human Rights

MEXICO CITY—The Revolutionary Workers Party (PRT) has declared that if it gains ballot status for the 1982 federal elections here it will present Rosario Ibarra de Piedra as its candidate for president.

Ibarra de Piedra heads the National Front Against Repression (FNCR), a coalition that includes some thirty trade-union, peasant, community, and student organizations, as well as political parties such as the PRT and the Mexican Communist Party.

The FNCR was founded in December 1979. It arose out of a struggle begun several years earlier by Rosario Ibarra de Piedra and other relatives of victims of the regime's repression.

Ibarra de Piedra first became active in the fight for human rights in Mexico after the April 1975 police kidnapping and subsequent "disappearance" of her son, Jesús Piedra Ibarra. In April 1977 she joined with other relatives of repression victims to found the National Committee to Defend Political Prisoners, the Politically Persecuted, "Disappeared," and Exiled.

As a result of the committee's protests and its efforts to publicize repression in Mexico internationally, the López Portillo government was forced to grant a partial amnesty in 1978, releasing dozens of political prisoners and allowing some exiles to return.

After the formation of the FNCR, Ibarra de Piedra said in an April 5 interview with *Intercontinental Press*, "the government released some eighteen of the 'disappeared,' who had been held in clandestine jails for eight months." Upon their release, "these valiant compañeros came to the FNCR and provided valuable testimony about the places they had been held, the number of persons found there, and how they had seen other compañeros alive who had been in the clandestine jails for two years or more."

Despite such victories, Ibarra de Piedra said, "the torture and kidnapping of dissidents continues." Forty former guerrillas are still being held by the government, despite testimony by the government's own investigators that "none of these compañeros present any danger to anyone."



Fred Murphy/IF

Banner near site of rally: "Legal Registration for the PRT."

Edgard Sánchez told the crowd at the April 5 rally. "He says that the government will respect our rights and grant registration to all parties that meet its requirements. But we don't place any confidence in such statements—we have no confidence that they will respect their own laws."

The PRT has already announced that if it is not granted ballot rights it will file suit in the Mexican courts to demand that the regime obey the provisions of its own electoral law.

Rising Class Struggle

The PRT is preparing for the 1982 elections at a time when struggles by the workers and peasants are on the rise in Mexico.

During the first ten months of 1980, the country experienced seventy-five strikes involving some 150,000 workers, the majority in basic industry. Automobile, steel, rubber, textile, telephone, paper, and beverage workers; machinists; miners; and teachers have all conducted militant struggles to resist the López Portillo regime's austerity policies and to fight for trade-union democracy against the PRI-dominated bureaucracy atop the workers movement.

In the countryside, small farmers, Indian communities, and landless laborers are resisting the government's moves to turn more and more land over to big capitalist agriculture and thus liquidate the agrarian-reform gains fought for and won during the Mexican revolution of 1910-21 and during the Cárdenas presidency of 1934-40.

Several independent peasant organizations have come together to form the National "Plan de Ayala" Coordinating Committee (CNPA)* and have called for a national peasant march on Mexico City on May 12.

The rising class struggle was reflected at the April 5 rally.

Seated on the platform were a number of trade-union representatives, from the Oax-

aca meat workers, the Copalillo henequen (sisal) workers, the university workers of Nuevo León, and the workers of CONASUPO, a state food-distribution enterprise.

Messages of solidarity with the PRT's ballot fight and in support of Rosario Ibarra de Piedra's candidacy for president were received from the textile workers union at the Textlamex factory, from the executive committee of the auto workers union at the big Nissan (Datsun) plant in Cuernavaca (currently on strike against arbitrary firings), from the Goodyear rubber workers (who had just participated in a victorious nationwide strike) and from other unions.

The first speaker of the day was Margarito Montes Parra, a PRT leader who is also general secretary of the Independent Revolutionary Peasants Coordinating Committee (CCRI), one of the principal forces in the CNPA.

Representatives of Indian communities from the states of Oaxaca and Guerrero were seated on the platform.

Delegations that traveled from outside the capital to attend the rally included textile, auto, and watch-factory workers from Toluca; shantytown dwellers, peasants and farm workers, and silver artisans from the state of Guerrero; university trade-union leaders and members of Indian communities from the state of Oaxaca; oil workers and peasants from the state of Veracruz; rail workers from Monterrey; and auto, textile, and university workers from Cuernavaca.

Several women's-rights organizations, such as the Feminist Current of the electrical workers union, sent greetings or delegations, as did two homosexual-rights groups.

Other tendencies on the Mexican left sent representatives to the rally to offer solidarity with the PRT's ballot fight and express their opinions on strategy in the 1982 elections.

International Solidarity

David Ferguson, a striking member of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) from Morgantown, West Virginia, brought greetings to the rally from the Socialist Workers Party of the United States.

"We are inspired by your fight for full legalization and ballot rights," Ferguson said, "because we have for years been conducting the same fight in the United States. Despite all their talk about democracy, the rulers in Washington are the worst enemies of genuine democracy for the working class. This is shown by their support to tyrants like Somoza, the shah, and many others throughout the world."

Ferguson pointed out how the SWP was putting the U.S. rulers on trial through its lawsuit against government spying and harassment. He explained how the current strike by coal miners shows that "American workers are beginning to fight back." And he was interrupted several times by applause when he described "the mounting opposition to U.S. intervention in Central America and growing solidarity with the revolution in El Salvador."

Hugo Blanco of the Peruvian PRT spoke of the gains in democratic rights achieved through the struggles of the workers and their allies in his country. "It has been the Peruvian masses, through five nationwide general strikes," Blanco said, "who have triumphed through the defeat of the military dictatorship, the liberation of most of the political prisoners, the legality of many parties of the left. They have triumphed by winning the right of the workers parties to have public headquarters and to demonstrate publicly."

Such gains in Peru, Blanco continued, "are one more demonstration of what is happening in Latin America. . . . Our countries are being shaken by a great revolutionary process in Central America: Cuba is no longer alone—there is Nicaragua, there is Grenada, and El Salvador is being shaken as well."

Saying that he did not want to "show an excess of optimism," however, Blanco called for redoubling solidarity with the people of Bolivia and other Latin American peoples suffering under military dictatorships, such as in Uruguay, Argentina, and Chile.

The rally concluded with the singing of the *International*.

Cause for Optimism

On April 10 the PRT submitted to the Federal Electoral Commission voluminous documentation of its activity as a "political association" during the past year. The next day, commission official Luis Dantón Rodríguez was widely quoted in the press as saying that the "political reform" would continue and that of all the parties seeking ballot status, the PRT most clearly represented a "distinct political position."

The official's remarks gave the PRT cause for optimism, but the party vowed to redouble its campaign—both to assure ballot status for itself and to extend solidarity to other parties and groups that are waging a similar fight for legalization. □

*The Plan de Ayala (Ayala Plan) was the name of the agrarian program put forward by Mexican revolutionary peasant leader Emiliano Zapata in 1911.

Tanks Sent Into Rebellious Yugoslav Province

By Ernest Harsch

Faced with an outbreak of nationalist ferment in the southern province of Kosovo, the Yugoslav government declared a state of emergency in the region April 2 and sent tanks and troops to the provincial capital, Pristina. The government threatened to use "all possible means" to put down the unrest.

It was the first major crisis to confront the new "collective leadership" in Belgrade since the death of Tito nearly a year ago.

Under the emergency measures, all public gatherings, marches, and demonstrations in Kosovo were banned. A dusk-to-dawn curfew was imposed, and movement into and out of the province was restricted. The territorial reserves were mobilized to assist the army and police.

On April 6, the government admitted that eleven persons had been killed and fifty-seven wounded in clashes between demonstrators and police.

A large majority of Kosovo's 1.7 million people are ethnic Albanians—nearly half as many as live in neighboring Albania. They have long resented the fact that they face greater poverty than other nationalities in Yugoslavia and that Kosovo's status as an "autonomous province" gives them fewer national rights than the Serbs, Croats, Macedonians, and other peoples of the six republics that make up the Yugoslav federation.

The ferment in Pristina began on March 11, when several thousand students poured out of the university and marched through the streets shouting slogans against the high cost of living and the lavish privileges enjoyed by government and party officials. The police attacked the demonstrators, and after several hours of clashes managed to disperse them with tear-gas.

Miners Join Protests

The protests, however, spread to other sectors of the population and other parts of the province. The students were joined by miners, and demonstrations were reported in at least half a dozen other towns.

Meanwhile, the demonstrators increasingly raised nationalist demands. Most called for the recognition of Kosovo as a full republic. Some demanded unification with neighboring Albania and chanted slogans in support of Enver Hoxha, the head of the Albanian Communist Party.

The unrest in Pristina reached a peak on April 1, when about 10,000 students, miners, and others attempted to march on the local prison to demand the release of those arrested during earlier demonstrations. The government claimed that some of the marchers were armed, and that they fired on



the police. The state of emergency was declared the next day.

In a news conference in Belgrade April 6, Stane Dolanc, a member of the Presidium of the League of Yugoslav Communists (the Communist Party), claimed that the protests were instigated from abroad by Yugoslav exiles who were either "pro-Fascist" or "pro-Cominform" (i.e., pro-Soviet). He charged that the demonstrations developed "nationalist, irredentist and counterrevolutionary overtones."

At the same time, Dolanc was forced to acknowledge that the people of Kosovo did face serious economic problems. He pledged that \$4.66 billion would be earmarked in the next five-year plan for accelerated economic development in the province.

Dolanc warned, however, "We are determined to normalize the situation by political action but, in case it's necessary, won't avoid the use of other measures." He rejected the demonstrators' demand that Kosovo become a republic.

A Poor Province

The nationalist discontent in Kosovo is fueled to a great extent by the economic and social disparities that its people face, compared to other parts of the country. Kosovo is Yugoslavia's poorest region, with a per capita gross national product only a third of the country's average. It has a very high unemployment rate.

It was not until the late 1960s that Albanians began to be promoted to positions of au-

thority in Kosovo in any significant numbers; before then, members of Kosovo's Serbian minority held most key posts.

In 1968, at a time of major student protests in Belgrade, large demonstrations were also staged in Pristina. They were put down only after the police killed several demonstrators and severely beat many others. In late 1974, and again in 1979, new eruptions were reported.

The economic problems facing Kosovo have been worsened by the country's general economic crisis. In January, prices were 47 percent higher than they were a year ago. Unemployment remains high, and many Yugoslav workers still have to travel abroad to find jobs in other European countries.

Last year, there were shortages of such essential consumer items as coffee, tea, butter, soap powder, and medicines. Also in 1980, real incomes fell by 8-10 percent.

In an interview in the Belgrade weekly *Nin* in February, Miran Potro, the head of Yugoslavia's official trade unions, admitted that discontent among workers was being caused by "high prices and inconsistencies in the implementation of the economic stabilisation policy."

Worker Discontent

This worker discontent has been expressed in frequent strikes, most of them centering around wages and working conditions. In the first eleven months of 1980 alone, there were some 130 strikes.

It is against this background that the authorities reacted so sharply to the demonstrations in Kosovo. As a report in the March 21 issue of the London *Economist* commented, "For the moment the Yugoslav leaders are worried not so much by the possibility that Kosovo's Albanians will try to split off from Yugoslavia and side with Albania, but that workers elsewhere in Yugoslavia might follow the example of Pristina's students and take their economic grievances to the streets."

There is another example that the authorities fear Yugoslav workers may follow—that of the workers in Poland.

Of all the other Eastern European countries, Yugoslavia is the only one in which the twenty-one demands raised by the Polish workers during the 1980 Gdansk strikes have been published. Yugoslav workers are quite conscious of what their comrades in Poland have been able to achieve.

In an interview in the December 18, 1980, *New York Times*, Miran Potro claimed that the Polish upsurge had made him and other trade-union officials more attentive to the demands of Yugoslav workers. He added,

somewhat wishfully, "I am certain our trade union members do not want to go beyond the Constitution and the labor laws."

But two months later, in his interview in *Nin*, Potro revealed how inaccurate such official assessments can be. He noted that workers in one big factory went out on strike just a few days after the enterprise's party conference had concluded that the political mood among the workers was "good."

Demands for Free Speech

Since the upheavals in Poland, Yugoslav dissidents have become bolder in their demands for freedom of the press and speech. As a result, freer discussion has been allowed in the semiofficial media at the same time that bans against independent journals—such as the dissident Marxist magazine *Praxis*—have been maintained.

Mihailo Markovic, one of the leaders of the *Praxis* group, commented in January, "The authorities have allowed some freedoms which did not exist until recently—and this is observable for example in the press or on television. They are willing to allow more freedom of expression as long as it is controlled. But they want to totally exclude those people, such as the *Praxis*

group, over whom they have no control."

Some of those who have had their journals banned have appealed the bannings in court, charging that they are unconstitutional. Several hundred intellectuals have signed petitions calling for abolition of those classes in the criminal code that restrict freedom of speech.

At a time of widespread economic difficulties, there have also been greater protests against the material privileges enjoyed by the bureaucrats who run Yugoslavia. As in Poland, a series of scandals has come to light involving fraud, embezzlement, and corruption among top officials.

During one scandal, the mayor of Belgrade was compelled to go on television to deny any wrongdoing and to reveal details of his family income. He denied that he had been the recipient of "women, music, or bacchanalia."

One Yugoslav diplomat, who was quoted in the January 21 *Washington Post*, complained, "When Tito was alive, it was always difficult to attack officials for their lavish lifestyle or their string of villas. They were after all only little Titos. Now, however, high living has become a legitimate target." □

Police Crack Down, Kill Four

Dominicans Protest U.S. Warship Visit

By Claudio Tavárez

SANTO DOMINGO—On April 6, police here opened fire on striking municipal workers, killing three people, including a journalist. Two days earlier, police in Mao, some 200 kilometers from the capital, shot and killed a student during demonstrations against the visit of U.S. warships to the Dominican Republic.

In addition to the demonstrations against the U.S. warships and the strike by municipal workers, some 3,000 Dominican doctors are on strike, demanding higher wages and an increase in the government's health-care budget.

Numerous student groups, unions, and political organizations took part in the demonstrations against the presence of the U.S. warships. The ships—the *Josephus Daniels* and the *Spiegel Grove*—are on a tour of the Caribbean. Although the United States International Communication Agency stated that "the visit will strengthen the spirit of cooperation that exists between the United States and the countries visited," people in the Dominican Republic were reminded of a previous April visit by U.S. warships in which thousands of Dominicans were killed.

On April 28, 1965, U.S. vessels landed American troops in the Dominican Republic to put down an insurrection aimed at

restoring elected President Juan Bosch to power. In all, more than 42,000 U.S. troops took part in the intervention, with forty U.S. warships offshore. When the troops were withdrawn, they left behind Joaquín Balaguer as the new president, who remained in power for twelve years.

U.S. troops also occupied the Dominican Republic from 1916 to 1924, during which time the country was under direct U.S. military rule.

The real purpose of the tour of the U.S. vessels, which began in early March, is to threaten the peoples of the Caribbean and Central America. It is aimed against those who have already freed themselves from the imperialist grip—like the peoples of Cuba, Grenada, and Nicaragua—as well as those who are struggling for their liberation, like the people of El Salvador.

Given the history of U.S. interventions in the Dominican Republic, and the Pentagon's military aid to the genocidal military/Christian Democratic junta in El Salvador, the Dominican people strongly opposed this show of strength by the U.S. Navy.

Many political and democratic organizations organized protest activities against the presence of the warships. The first was to be a massive, peaceful demonstration on

Avenida George Washington, which runs along the Caribbean shore in the capital.

Three hours before the demonstration was scheduled to begin, the entire length of the avenue was occupied by the military. When demonstrators began arriving at the assembly area, they were attacked by police. Hundreds were arrested. Journalists covering the scene were threatened and had their film confiscated. One reporter, Mateo Morrison, was beaten by the "Black Helmets" of the National Police and had to be hospitalized.

Other protests were to take place at the university campus in Santo Domingo and in cities around the country. But the police prevented many demonstrations from taking place by occupying the sites beforehand.

As a result, there were a number of confrontations between the police and students. Students who tried to go ahead with the protests were attacked with tear gas, clubs, and guns.

The unequal battles between police and students continued for several days after the U.S. warships had left the Dominican Republic.

On April 4 a student of agricultural sciences, Ángela Peña Guzmán, was shot and killed by police in a classroom at the Northeast Regional University Center in the province of Valverde Mao.

On April 6 in Santo Domingo, police opened fire on striking municipal workers. In the gunfire, journalist Marcelino Vega and two youths were killed.

These murders indicate the extent to which President Antonio Guzmán Fernández is willing to resort to violent repression to deal with the growing opposition to his anti-working-class policies.

The National Council of Trade-Union Unity (CNUS) has called an April 12 demonstration to protest the police shootings. □

SWP Condemns Killings

The following telegram was sent on April 8 to Dominican President Guzmán Fernández. It was signed on behalf of the U.S. Socialist Workers Party by Omari Musa, who had just returned from a recent tour of the Dominican Republic.

"We condemn murder of Marcelino Vega and three others this week. Vega helped me during recent tour of Dominican Republic. He will be missed. The police assassin who shot him in cold blood must be prosecuted.

"Dominican workers and students refuse to allow U.S. war ships in while U.S. 'advisors' and arms murder Salvadoran people. In same spirit U.S. dockworkers refuse to load material for bloody Salvadoran junta. This solidarity grows irrepressibly.

"We support CNUS call for April 12 protest rally and demand you keep hands off.

"Stop repression of journalists and workers movement."

The Polish Revolution—How it Developed, Where It is Going

By David Frankel

A political and social revolution has been unfolding in Poland for the past eight months.

This revolution, led by the industrial working class, began with the massive strike wave of August 1980. Since then the Polish workers and their allies—farmers, students, intellectuals, and others—have carried out the biggest and most successful struggle for workers democracy to take place in any bureaucratized workers state since the rise of Stalinism.

Already the struggle in Poland has gone far deeper and won far more than the Hungarian revolution of 1956 and the struggle in Czechoslovakia in 1968.

Poland, of course, is not a capitalist country in which the factories, mines, and shipyards are privately owned. The tasks of the Polish revolution are not to overturn the economic foundations of society and establish new relations of production.

But neither are the Polish workers and their allies merely fighting for a change in government. The real thrust of their demands is for a change in the way the entire country is run, from top to bottom.

This is not only a question of democratic rights and the composition of government ministries and local authorities. It includes the educational system, the administration of health care, the character of the newspapers and electronic media, the administration of the economy—both at the national level and at each factory and farm—and the elimination of the pervasive privilege and inequality that eats away at the foundations of the Polish workers state.

Although the antibureaucratic revolution in Poland will not usher in new property relations as will the socialist revolution in France or the United States, it is a social revolution in virtually every other respect.

As the workers win their demands, they are changing the face of Polish society. And they are showing in action that the scope of the changes they are fighting for require the same proletarian methods of struggle and the same massive class mobilizations as the socialist revolution in the capitalist countries.

Capitalist Crisis Forces Gierek's Hand

When the Polish government moved to sharply increase meat prices on July 1, 1980, it knew that it was playing with fire. It was precisely this issue of food prices that touched off the workers' revolt in the Baltic seacoast cities of Gdansk and Szczecin in December 1970. That revolt led to the downfall of Wladyslaw Gomulka as

head of the Communist Party (officially known as the Polish United Workers Party) and his replacement by Edward Gierek after tanks opened fire on the workers, killing dozens.

Massive strikes broke out again in June 1976, when Gierek tried to raise meat prices. The regime beat a hasty retreat.

But Gierek's hand was being forced by the same international capitalist crisis that has led to increased attacks on the working class in every part of the world. Poland's massive debt to the imperialist banks, coupled with declining export markets due to the economic crisis in the capitalist countries, squeezed the regime into a corner.

Looked at from this angle, the struggle of the Polish workers against austerity measures and the political repression needed to enforce them is part of the same process that has resulted in the Iranian revolution, increased mass pressure on capitalist regimes throughout the semicolonial world, and is radicalizing the labor movements in Western Europe and the United States.

Development of the Revolution

Immediately after the increase of meat prices on July 1 there were strikes in a number of industrial strongholds, particularly in the Gdansk shipyards and in the Warsaw area. These actions forced the bureaucracy to make some concessions, but seemed to blow over quickly.

However, new strikes kept on breaking out. No sooner did the regime grant wage increases or promise additional meat supplies in one area, than the workers in another area walked off the job.

As the working class gained experience and confidence through these actions, the strike movement spread. It reached a new level with the general strike of the Gdansk workers, led by the vanguard of industrial workers at the Lenin Shipyard. Their walkout on August 14 was sparked by the dismissal of Anna Walentynowicz, a crane operator who had participated in the 1970 and 1976 upsurges.

By August 18, about 100,000 workers in the Baltic cities of Gdansk, Gdynia, and Sopot were on strike, and the strikes had also spread to the Baltic ports of Elblag and Szczecin.

Along with the extension of the working class mobilization came the organization of strike committees linking the workers in various enterprises, and then in various cities.

At the same time, the struggle was

broadened to include a program of political as well as economic demands. These demands continue to be at the center of the struggle.

Among the demands raised by the strikers were freedom of expression and the abolition of censorship; release of all political prisoners; recognition of the right to strike and to form independent trade unions; abolition of privileges for police and party officials; and that the regime take steps to inform "the public fully about the socio-economic situation in the country. . . ." (See *Intercontinental Press*, August 25, 1980, p. 845.)

The rapidity with which the workers struggle went from economic to political demands is a general feature of upsurges in the bureaucratized workers states. Joseph Hansen, who was a longtime leader of the U.S. Socialist Workers Party and of the Fourth International, pointed out in an article in the Spring 1958 issue of the *International Socialist Review*:

"Because of the peculiar role of the state in Soviet life, the economic struggle against material inequalities tends to merge with the political struggle for democracy. The government is not only the upholder of the totalitarian political structure but also the direct employer, the regulator of planning, production and distribution. This imparts extraordinary explosive force to large-scale economic struggles, since a fight over distribution of the national income can quickly become transformed into a political fight over who shall wield state power, the bureaucrats or the workers.

"The revolutionary challenge emerges so sharply because the workers cannot achieve economic equality without winning political democracy—and this means deposing bureaucracy, stripping it of all its arbitrary powers and privileges."

Industrial Workers Take the Lead

From the beginning of the Polish revolution it has been evident that the industrial working class is the force that is driving the process forward. Bastions of the industrial workers, such as the Lenin Shipyard, the Nowa Huta steelworks, and the Ursus tractor plant were the center of the movement from the first days.

As the strikes spread rail workers, auto workers, rubber workers, machinists, and coal miners from workplaces throughout the country joined in.

The independent workers' organizations that rose out of these strikes provided an example of democratic organization.

Elected delegates reported back regularly to their factories, and their actions were subject to the approval of the workers assemblies in each workplace. The meetings of the strike committee at the Lenin Shipyard were piped outside so the entire workforce could follow the discussions.

Although Gierek charged that "anarchist and anti-socialist groups" were behind the strikes and warned that their actions "will not be tolerated," the power of the industrial workers quickly brought him to the negotiating table. On August 31, the signing of an agreement was broadcast on national television.

For the first time in the history of any of the Stalinized workers states, the workers had established a national organization free from the control of the bureaucratic caste governing the country, and had forced the regime to grant legal recognition to their independent organization.

Reform and Revolution

In winning the right to form independent trade unions, the Polish workers immensely strengthened their position in relationship to the regime. The establishment of independent unions laid the basis for further steps toward overturning the entire system of bureaucratic rule.

Joseph Hansen offered a general explanation of this process in the article quoted above. "To stand by a program of political revolution," he explained, "does not exclude either fighting for reforms or winning reforms. In fact, it presupposes such a struggle. . . ."

"Reforms are partial successes on the road to more definitive solutions of pressing problems: they can stimulate the working class and help prepare the stage for bigger struggles for more decisive goals. . . ."

"It is much closer to reality to view the program of political revolution as *the total series of reforms, gained through militant struggle, culminating in the transfer of power to the workers.*

"No revolution comes in a single over-size dose like a horse pill. It develops in interlinked stages affecting interlinked fields. If any of the demands of any of the stages be viewed in isolation, or fixed as an end in itself rather than a means to a higher goal, it appears as a reform. If its connection to the demands of other stages be kept in mind, it appears as a transitional step. It is only when the process is viewed as a whole—in its origin, its fundamental aims and final results—that it appears for what it really is, a revolution: an organic qualitative change in whatever structure is involved."

In the case of Poland, the victory of the August general strike did indeed 'stimulate the working class and help prepare the stage for bigger struggles.'

One Silesian coal miner remarked: "As the strikes continued, we got time to think about these free trade unions and freedom



Lech Walesa, a leader of Solidarity, carried aloft by supporters.

of expression, and to come to understand what we really thought about this deep down in ourselves."

Just one day after the signing of the Gdansk agreement, eight coal miners were killed and eighteen injured in an accident at the Halemba mine. The result was a walkout by 300,000 Silesian miners. They demanded abolition of the government-controlled unions in the upper Silesian area, shorter workdays and other safety improvements, and expressed their solidarity with the demands of the Baltic strikers.

Coal is Poland's most important natural resource and export product, and the miners have the greatest weight of any section of the Polish working class. Their action drove the final nail into Gierek's coffin. He was replaced as party head by Stanislaw Kania on September 6.

Peasants, Students, Professionals Follow Example of Workers

Solidarity, the independent trade union federation, swept across Poland in the weeks following the August 31 agreement. At their first national conference on September 17 the independent unions already claimed a membership of 3 million. It was not long before the membership swelled to 10 million—almost the entire Polish working class.

All of Polish society was galvanized by the example of the workers. Painters and sculptors began meeting to demand an end to censorship of their works. Scientists in Warsaw held meetings to set up their own independent organization. They demanded the right to travel freely and guarantees that there would be no more firings for political reasons.

Students initiated struggles against the bureaucracy's heavy-handed control of education, and professors demanded that university administrators no longer be named by the regime.

Most important of all, the farmers were inspired to organize themselves and raise their own demands. Central to the upsurge of the farmers is their demand that the regime make it possible for them to maintain their land and stop treating them as second-class citizens.

Because of their crucial role in food production and in production for export, their numerical strength, and their particular history and consciousness as a distinct social class, the farmers are the most powerful and important ally of the Polish workers.

At each step in the development and consolidation of Solidarity, the bureaucracy resisted the advance of the workers and farmers. Even after the August

strikes, the workers were forced to resort to strikes in hundreds of individual factories in order to gain recognition for local branches of Solidarity.

Regime Provokes Confrontations

In November 1980, the government provoked a sharp confrontation over the statutes of the new union. Jozef Klasa, a member of the ruling party's Central Committee, declared November 7:

"The party has decided for the first time since August to exploit all possibilities . . . to prevent a strike. This includes resorting to administrative measures such as declaring strikes illegal in certain enterprises."

But the regime was forced to back down by the unity of the workers and the solidity of their organization. On November 10 the Polish Supreme Court ruled in favor of the union.

In some cases the workers were able to turn back the attacks by the bureaucracy and go over to the offensive. In the Czestochowa district in southern Poland, for example, the governor informed local factory managers November 10 that a state of emergency was going to be declared. He told them to confiscate all typewriters and duplicating machines in the hands of the independent trade unions and to require the workers to sign statements of loyalty to the government and the party.

When managers attempted to carry out these measures, strike alerts were issued in some 200 factories. The workers forced the resignation of the heads of the provincial and municipal councils.

Local struggles against victimization of Solidarity activists, for union recognition, to enforce agreements that had already been reached, and against the bureaucracy's heavy-handed censorship continued throughout Poland. Through such struggles the workers have been able to take big steps toward establishing in practice democratic rights such as free speech and association, and the right to demonstrate.

One of the most vivid indications of the shift in the relationship of forces between the workers and the bureaucracy was the rally of 500,000 people in Gdansk December 16. Top government officials attended and participated with Solidarity leaders in unveiling a huge monument to the workers gunned down during the 1970 upsurge.

Fight Over Forty-Hour Workweek

Two struggles in particular contributed to the extension of the rights of the toiling masses, and showed how the workers and farmers are using the rights they have wrested from the bureaucracy to make further gains. These were the struggle over legalization of the farmers organization, Rural Solidarity, and the fight for a five-day, forty-hour workweek.

Although the regime has not yet agreed

to fully legalize Rural Solidarity, it pledged on March 31 to stop obstructing the activities of the 1.3-million-member organization. It took a campaign of rallies, sit-ins, and finally, after a police attack that hospitalized three union leaders, the threat of an open-ended general strike by Solidarity to win this pledge.

In its struggle for a five-day workweek, Solidarity pulled millions of workers off their jobs on January 10 and again on January 24. On January 31, the regime bowed to the demands of the workers.

Accompanying these struggles for the right to organize and the right to a better life, the workers and farmers have raised demands for the dismissal of especially hated officials and for the curbing of bureaucratic abuses, arbitrary measures by the police, and privilege.

An eleven-day general strike in Bielsko-Biala, a textile manufacturing center in southern Poland, came to an end February 6 after the 200,000 strikers won their demand for the ouster of the local governor and several of his aides.

Just three days later, on February 9, some 300,000 workers walked off their jobs in the Jelenia Gora area to push for the dismissal of the local trade union minister, who was also the head of the Communist Party in the region. They also called for the conversion of facilities used only by officials and party members into public centers.

Also on February 9, Prime Minister Jozef Pinkowski was replaced by Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski—the fourth change of prime ministers in less than a year.

Can the Polish Regime Be Reformed?

The success that the workers have had in pushing back the bureaucracy, in securing specific gains, in forcing the removal of some of the worst officials, raises the question of whether the workers can

achieve their aims through a process of reform.

This question is posed all the more sharply by the divisions that have appeared within the Communist Party. There has been a massive influx of party members into Solidarity, demands from the party ranks for the removal of corrupt officials, for the thorough democratization of party life, and for the renewal of political life in Poland.

All these demands deserve support. However, the fact remains that the same apparatus that administered the system of bureaucratic rule for so many years still remains in place.

Past experience shows that failure to dismantle this apparatus will result in the erosion and eventual nullification of most of the gains made by the workers. That was the case following the 1956 upsurge and again after 1970.

Nor should this come as any surprise. Substantial material interests are involved in the system of bureaucratic rule, not merely mistaken ideas on the part of the bureaucracy. The privileged, petty-bourgeois bureaucratic caste makes concessions to the workers during periods of mass upsurge, and moves to take back whatever they can when the struggle recedes.

To break out of this, the workers have to do with the government what they have done with the trade unions—replace the bureaucratized structure with one that will enable them to exert direct control.

The program of political revolution, while taking the fight for reforms as a point of departure, represents a strategic approach that rejects the slightest confidence in the bureaucrats, however conciliatory they may be at any instant. It relies completely on the independent organization and mobilization of the workers, peasants, and intellectuals themselves.



As in any struggle, this is the most effective way to win immediate reforms as well as to advance the longterm interests of the masses.

Process of Masses Entering Battle

A revolution is not just the final, decisive confrontation that marks the shift in power from one class or one ruling group to another. It is the whole process by which the masses enter into battle, test their strength, organize themselves, gain confidence, sift out their leadership, and gain an understanding of the tasks before them.

In the case of the Iranian revolution, for example, the massive insurrection that overthrew the monarchy in February 1979 was preceded by a whole year of increasingly powerful mass mobilizations. It was clear that a revolution was underway by October 1978. Nor is that revolution over yet.

Similarly, the Nicaraguan revolution developed over a period of a year and a half before Somoza was finally overthrown. Mass protests and a general strike followed the murder of opposition leader Pedro Joaquín Chamorro in January 1978. This prepared the ground for the Sandinista National Liberation Front's August-September 1978 offensive.

But it was not until July 1979 that the Somoza dictatorship was finally destroyed and a workers and farmers government established. Today, the workers are driving forward the class struggle on the road toward consolidating a workers state.

Among the factors that indicate a revolution is taking place in Poland are:

- The sustained character of the upsurge. Since August hardly a week has passed without its share of strikes, demonstrations, and the expansion of political discussion and debate.
- The depth and extent of the mass movement. Every part of Poland, from Warsaw and the port cities on the Baltic to the smallest farming villages has been drawn into the ferment. In sheer numbers, the size of the mass actions, in particular the strikes coordinated by Solidarity, have been comparable to the mobilizations during the Iranian revolution.
- The clear class character of the struggle. Although substantial layers from every social sector have participated in actions against the regime, the movement has been led by the industrial workers, organized in their own unions. Every factory in Poland has become a center of political discussion and debate, and the workers are increasingly asserting their right to control conditions on the job.
- The sweeping demands being raised by the workers and their allies. As both Soviet and Polish leaders have repeatedly pointed out in their attacks on the workers, this is a political movement that is challenging the Communist Party's monopoly on political power.

Like any revolution, the working class upheaval in Poland must be seen in a broader international context. On the most fundamental level, the Polish revolution is part of the struggle of the world working class for the establishment of socialism.

Although capitalism has been abolished in Poland, the working class has been barred from exercising political power by a parasitic bureaucracy. This bureaucracy stands as an obstacle to the continued development of the Polish economy and to improving the conditions of the working class.

Just as the bureaucracy puts its own narrow interests first inside of Poland, doing everything in its power to preserve its privileged status, it follows a narrowly nationalist policy in world affairs.

This approach is in polar contrast to the proletarian internationalist policies of the Cuban leadership. Cuba has far fewer resources than Poland and is in a far more vulnerable position in regard to imperialism, but it plays a far bigger role internationally in aiding revolutionary struggles. And in Cuba, the government takes the initiative in mobilizing the masses against bureaucratic abuses and privilege-seeking social layers.

Not surprisingly, the world working class has identified with the mobilizations of our sisters and brothers in Poland, and has been inspired by their courage and power. In the United States it has become common for workers fighting back against attacks by the bosses to cite the example of the Polish workers. In Western Europe, the impact has been even greater, including among workers in the mass Communist parties in Italy, France, and other countries.

From the other side of the class line, the imperialists hate the militant example of independent organization and self-reliance provided by the Polish workers. They support the Polish regime's attempts to impose austerity on the working class. The international bankers depend on the success of this policy for the prompt repayment of their massive loans to the Warsaw government.

At the same time, Washington and its allies have repeatedly warned against any Soviet military moves into Poland. There are two elements to this stance. In the first place, while opposing a workers revolution, the imperialists really are in favor of the Polish government establishing maximum political independence from Moscow. A Yugoslav-type regime in Warsaw would open up new opportunities for Washington in the diplomatic arena.

But an even bigger consideration for the imperialists is the use of this issue as part of their ideological offensive within their own countries. By playing up the threat of Soviet invasion, the imperialist rulers seek to portray the Soviet Union as an aggressive power that must be countered by a bigger military buildup.

While the U.S. ruling class and its allies have no sympathy whatsoever for the goals of the Polish workers, they are perfectly willing to give lip service to their cause in order to advance imperialist interests.

Any Soviet invasion of Poland would be a windfall for Washington's militarization drive. And it would be used by the U.S. rulers to try to justify their own intervention against the workers and peasants of Central America and the Caribbean.

Shaky Regimes in East Europe

Another factor in the international context of the Polish revolution is the Stalinist bureaucracies in the Soviet Union and the East European workers states. These petty-bourgeois castes are caught between the pressures of the world working class and world imperialism.

Internationally, the bureaucratic regimes are being pressed for support and solidarity by the rebellious workers and peasants in Central America, Indochina, and elsewhere. The imperialists, meanwhile, are pressing Moscow and its allies to take the opposite tack and withhold aid to revolutionary struggles around the world.

At home, the bureaucratic castes face the demands of the workers and farmers for better living standards, for an end to inequality and corruption, and for democratic rights. On the other side, however, are the pressures of the international capitalist economy. It was these pressures that touched off the crisis in Poland last August.

It should come as no surprise that the bureaucratic rulers are terrified at the prospect of the ferment in Poland spreading to the workers and peasants in their own countries.

The East German, Hungarian, and Czechoslovak bureaucracies have all faced similar rebellions in the past, and they know that their future is far from secure. Hoping to quarantine the revolutionary infection, the East German regime imposed restrictions on travel to and from Poland in October 1980, and the Czechoslovak regime followed suit in November.

For the Romanian regime, the strike by the Silesian coal miners must have raised particularly unpleasant memories. About 35,000 miners in the Jiu Valley, the largest mining area in Romania, went out on strike in August 1977. President Nicolae Ceausescu was forced to meet with the miners, who greeted him with shouts of "Down with the proletarian bourgeoisie." Although the struggle was later repressed, it is indicative of the pressures building up in Eastern Europe—and in the Soviet Union as well.

Threats From Moscow

Ultimately, all of the East European regimes depend on the threat of Soviet military intervention for their continued

existence. During the 1940s and 1950s Stalin would order heads of government appointed or deposed at will. Today Soviet methods of domination are normally not quite as heavy-handed, but when bureaucratic interests are threatened as they were in Czechoslovakia in 1968, Moscow is capable of taking the most brutal measures.

This domination is especially resented in Poland, which was divided up between Russia, Prussia, and Austria in the eighteenth century, and only regained its national independence after World War I.

Among the considerations that have so far held Moscow back from going to war against the Polish working class are the prospect of massive military resistance, the political price the Soviet regime would pay in the world working-class movement, and the effect such a war would have on the consciousness of the workers and peasants in the rest of Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union itself.

Time, moreover, is not on the side of the bureaucrats. With each passing week the Polish workers are gaining in confidence and their independent organizations are growing in strength and experience.

The longer the struggle goes on, the more the workers of the world see, the higher the price Moscow will pay for any attempt to crush the Polish workers by military force.

Up to now, the threat of Soviet military intervention has been used by the bureaucracy to try to intimidate the workers and to force them to make concessions. At the same time, the bureaucracy has sought to divide the workers movement, trying to isolate the most militant and conscious elements and play upon backward prejudices.

Appeal to Anti-Semitism

Certainly the most convincing example of the reactionary social character of the bureaucratic caste ruling Poland was its attempt early in March to stir up anti-Semitic sentiment as a means of dividing the workers movement. But Warsaw Solidarity issued a general appeal for people "to stand against this attempt at anti-Semitic action," and after one halfhearted rally the scum of Polish society slunk back to their holes.

A more sustained attack has been carried out against the Committee for Social Self-Defense (KOR), and in particular against Jacek Kuron, its chief leader. Kuron has been repeatedly attacked in statements issued by both Soviet and Polish officials, and he has been repeatedly arrested by Polish authorities.

Kuron, the most prominent opposition figure in Poland for many years, is also a central figure in Solidarity. The Polish rulers insist that while it is legitimate for workers to organize around bread-and-butter economic issues, it is not acceptable for Solidarity to take an interest in the

broad political issues facing Polish society. Kuron symbolizes this kind of political involvement, and the attack on him is aimed at dividing the ranks of Solidarity on this issue.

The regime has had an important ally in its attempts to retard and divide the workers movement in the Polish Catholic Church hierarchy. In the middle of the August strike wave, the head of the Polish church appealed to the strikers to return to work. Similar appeals have been issued several times since then in an attempt to undermine the unity of the movement.

Despite such pressures, the leadership of



Solidarity has refused to abandon any sector of the movement to repression by the regime, and it has resisted attempts by the church hierarchy to dictate the course of the struggle.

A Proletarian, Class-Struggle Leadership

Every revolution raises the question of leadership. The Polish workers have been particularly fortunate in this regard.

The leadership of Solidarity is a working-class leadership that has arisen in the factories, mines, and shipyards. It has been tempered by the struggles of 1970 and 1976, and it has proven itself to be extremely capable in the face of the most difficult circumstances.

The first and most basic test of any class-struggle leadership is that it rely on and advance the independent organization and mobilization of the working class and its allies. The leadership of Solidarity has certainly met this test.

Not only has it led in the formation of an independent workers organization of 10 million members, it has also helped in the organization of Rural Solidarity, the mass farmers organization, and in the struggles of students and other social layers.

Decisions of the movement have been determined by gatherings of elected representatives from workplaces all over the country. Different views are stated and discussed, votes are taken, and the decisions of the majority are implemented. This kind of democratic functioning ena-

bles the power of the ranks to be most effectively mobilized.

An important step forward for carrying out discussion in the workers movement and for extending its ability to organize the masses on the national level was the appearance of the first issue of *Tygodnik Solidarnosc* (Solidarity Weekly)—the union's own newspaper—on April 4.

Tactical Divisions

As is to be expected in any struggle of this scope, tactical differences within the leadership have arisen at various times. The capitalist media has generally tended to counterpose the "moderate" Lech Walesa to elements in the leadership that it describes as more "militant." For example, tactical differences arose in Solidarity around whether or not to call off the threatened general strike on March 31 and accept an agreement on disputed issues. After democratic discussion the majority of Solidarity delegates voted to accept the accord. (See *Intercontinental Press*, April 13, 1981, p. 368.)

The attempt by the capitalist press to portray this as a triumph of the "moderates" over the "militants" tells nothing about which view best advanced the class struggle.

Such questions can only be decided by the workers themselves. They are in the best position to judge the situation accurately, and they are the ones who must bear the consequences.

New Contingent Enters Class Struggle

It is no accident that the industrial workers in Poland have moved into the center of politics and are fighting for their class interests. The same process is taking place throughout the world, from Iran to the United States.

The Polish workers are already having a big impact on working-class fighters around the world. And they in turn will be affected by the class struggle in other countries.

As the struggle of the Polish workers and peasants continues, and as Solidarity tries to find allies on a world scale, it will look more and more to the battles of workers and peasants in other countries. Its own class base and the content of its demands drive it in that direction—in the direction of Marxism.

Meanwhile, the Polish workers and their class-struggle leadership deserve the fullest solidarity from the international workers movement. A powerful new contingent of the world working class has entered into struggle. This represents one more confirmation of the revolutionary Marxist program, and of the revolutionary character of our epoch. □

**Don't you know someone
who should be reading
Intercontinental Press?**

'The Workers Must Be Able to Make the Decisions'

[The following interview was conducted in February 1981 in Torun, Poland. Torun is a city of 230,000 inhabitants, less than 100 miles south of Gdansk. The Towimor machine tool factory, which produces machines for shipyards, is located in Torun.

[During the August 1980 strikes in Poland, the strike committee at Towimor was built with the active participation of Communist Party members in the plant. Some of them were elected to the strike committee. Subsequently the strike activists were elected to the plant's party leadership.

[The first secretary of the Towimor party group, Zbigniew Iwonow, was expelled from the party by higher bodies. But he was immediately reelected first secretary by the Towimor party organization, despite his expulsion.

[The interview with Iwonow was conducted by Pierre Caen, and was published in the March 16 issue of the French-language fortnightly *Inprecor*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Question. Can you tell us what took place in the party unit inside the Towimor factory?

Answer. It began with the strike. Most of the party members in our factory supported the strike. Some were even on the strike committee. One party member, Stanichesky, was even the delegate from the strike to Gdansk.

After the strike we very quickly realized that the Solidarity union was like insurance for the people. But we had to seek some insurance within the party, because the party had already gone through so many crises that it could not survive another one. We became conscious that the most important thing was to proceed to really democratic elections in the party.

Despite the resistance of the party leadership at the city and departmental level, we were soon able to organize democratic elections in our plant, which took place on August 15, by using the party rule that stated that an election could be called when 30 percent of the members requested it.

As a result of the new election, people who had been on the strike committee became part of the party leadership at the Towimor plant. The first phase of our work was to help Solidarity, because we had seen that it was very important that the union grow. Later we had to pull out of the strike committee because the bylaws of Solidarity say that people who hold positions in the party cannot have positions of responsibility in Solidarity. It is not possible to have two big responsibilities and be able to carry both of them out properly.

Nonetheless, we have done everything we could to help our comrades in the MKZ [the local branch of Solidarity] because we are still members of Solidarity.

We very quickly realized that the changes we had made in our party at the plant level were still not enough. We therefore sought to make contact with other members of party organizations who thought like we did. The party group at the university was the first one to respond to this call. We were able to establish an interplant commission. We no longer had any confidence in what the authorities said. They were passive and did not do anything. The people who were "high up" were compromised.

Initially eight party organizations became part of the commission in late September. The first goal of this interplant organization was to proceed to really democratic elections and to work out a program for the party congress that really came from the ranks. The interplant commission was not warmly greeted by the provincial leaders [laughter]. They felt threatened.

There are now thirty-two organizations involved in the interplant commission. The commission is a body without a chief. There is a weekly meeting, and at each meeting someone else presides, so that no one can dominate everyone else.

All the documents that the commission works out are circulated in all the rank-and-file bodies of the party, where they are discussed and people state whether or not they approve of the document.

These discussions deal with whatever the members want. We focus on questions such as how we want to see the party evolve in the future and how to work with Solidarity.

There are two basic subjects that have emerged: first, the changes in the party's statutes; second, the party's role in society.

Now we are going to explain the nature of the conflict we have with the party leadership.

We expressed a difference inside the departmental commission: We said we have to get rid of this unanimity that is the basis of the party's functioning. Our organization in Towimor, which was the first to organize democratic elections, is the most radical in the commission, and those "high up" felt that Stanichesky and I were a great danger to the party, that we were the black sheep.

Because we are workers, we do not act like diplomats. We don't mince our words in meetings. When we think that someone is a thief or a gangster, we say it clearly. The people who do not want the party to go through a renewal are not pleased to hear such talk, because they are not used to working in this way. They think you should always applaud when the first secretary

speaks, without asking whether what he says is good or not, and that you should not shout out that the person is an idiot and is talking nonsense.

And I was expelled from the party on such questions of form rather than substance. It was a little like the Inquisition. One Sunday I was told I had to come to a conference on Monday, and on Monday I was expelled. But the factory party group rejected this. So now I am a first party secretary who is not in the party! [laughter].

Of course, I wrote a letter, but in three months I have not had an answer. Clearly the commission must have a lot of work expelling other members who are bigger fish than I am! Today the party control commission is going to come and discuss [laughter] my case.

It is a game to win some time because that commission cannot do anything to back up its decision. It wants to win some time. I am not unduly concerned and I continue with my work.

Q. How do you see the aftermath of the preparation of the congress?

A. Our positions are majority positions in the party. Only a few thousand—with their families who are doing well—try to defend themselves. . . .

Q. In your opinion, does the leadership have the means to prevent your program from being heard at the congress? Can it block the process?

A. They want to stifle it, but today you hear the same thing said all over Poland. There is also Solidarity, which is our insurance and will defend us.

Q. How do you think democratic elections can be imposed on all levels before the congress?

A. The first stage is unfolding here in Torun. There will be elections for the departmental committee before the end of March. Here we have imposed this election. Perhaps if the first link of the chain breaks, the whole chain will break. How do we see this democratic election? Organized like in Solidarity.

The present party statutes contain several points that are not democratic and that we want to change. The number of candidates is limited, which must not be allowed to continue. And the votes can be manipulated because not everyone is represented; someone is sent from Warsaw and he is elected. These two current antidemocratic practices are very negative.

Here in our discussions we go even fur-

ther. We think that it would be good if the party authorities were elected by direct vote at every level. For example, in a party meeting to elect a party secretary, there would be several candidates, each of whom would express their program, and then there would be an intelligent vote. Each person, by voting for their candidate, would feel responsible for the one he chose.

We have also thought about the party's role. Up to now our party had a role it should not have had. It duplicated the functions of the state (administration, police). Therefore we think that we have to do away with this situation where the state apparatus in each arena is duplicated by the party apparatus; we have to do away with this bureaucracy.

We also must reflect on what the role of the Communist Party in the factory should be. It should be a force that makes proposals on all the problems and not an instrument of the government. I would like to have that kind of party in our country. To join this party people should have to wait one or two years to show they know what to do, so we have quality rather than quantity.

Q. People have spoken of self-management on the factory level, but how do you envision self-management on the level of all of society, so that the workers can be the ones who really make the decisions?

A. Today they say that the factories belong to us, but that is not true. They are in the hands of the government. The government is led by a very limited group, not even by the entire political bureau of the party, but only some of the members. And they are the ones who make the decisions. Society as a whole has no influence, but it feels all the consequences of all their decisions. That is why we think that this reform must be carried out as quickly as possible.

What should this reform be? A thorough housecleaning throughout Poland.

Me, I think that the factories must have greater autonomy and the workers must be able to make the decisions. I imagine it as a body of councils of all the workers who would have shares in the factory. Of course they could not sell these shares because those who had the most money would gain. The workers would be able to decide how the enterprise should be developed, how to distribute, how to find sales outlets; it would be a reform of the entire management of the factory. Marketing would have to be expanded.

European Subscribers

Subscriptions to Europe are now being processed through New York. Please address all correspondence to:

Intercontinental Press
410 West Street
New York, New York 10014

Q. Do you have contacts with people in other cities who agree with these same plans? What kinds of exchanges do you have?

A. Yes we have exchanges, especially with Gdansk and Krakow. We send each other materials and meet together. But what we are saying evokes strong resistance because such a reform would considerably limit the administration, especially in Warsaw.

Q. Don't you specifically think that the party leadership, which has already clashed with Solidarity, will see that people like you are challenging it and react violently?

A. We have no other solutions. We must go and see as many people as possible who think as we do, to educate and inform them. But we are already doing that. We have many meetings where we discuss with them. People have to stop being afraid.

Q. Do you think the discussion will continue after the congress?

A. Of course.

Q. How do you view the collaboration between the party radicals and Solidarity?

A. There are many areas where we think the same way, especially in the area of social policy. Neither the party nor Solidarity can be isolated from the problems of the moment. Under present conditions, it is impossible for Solidarity to focus solely on economic problems, as the government would like it to. Our differences with Solidarity relate to international policy. We are working under very specific conditions. Unhappily, in your country, you have better conditions. Obviously I'm not speaking about meteorological conditions! [laughter].

[At this point the interview had to end because the party control commission arrived at the party's factory offices.] □

Statement of Socialist Workers Party

High Stakes in U.S. Miners Strike

[Since March 27, 160,000 members of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) have been on strike. Several days later they voted by a two-to-one margin against a proposed contract, and sent pickets out to close down nonunion mines.

[The following statement was issued April 7 by the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party. It is taken from the April 17 issue of the socialist news-weekly *Militant*.]

* * *

The most important battle in the American class struggle today is the fight by the United Mine Workers in defense of their union and for a decent contract.

They are standing up to an effort by the mineowners—big oil, big steel, electric power companies, and banks—to impose contract provisions that would weaken the union and expand nonunion mining operations.

The miners' fight is in the lead of resistance to reduced living standards and slashes in social services that the Reagan administration and big business are trying to shove down our throats. Miners have led the way in challenging the administration budget with their two-day political strike and March 9 demonstration in Washington, D.C., against cuts in black lung benefits.

The miners' strike is, in reality, challenging attempts to make working people pay for massive increases in the military budget and for U.S. support to the blood-drenched dictatorship in El Salvador.

It is a battle against the price-gouging

energy monopolies, which seek a tighter stranglehold over fuel supplies.

The employers are out to break this resistance. But the miners are fighting back. They identify strongly with the courage and unity of their brothers and sisters in Poland.

A victory for the miners will strengthen the hand of all intended victims of the big-business/government offensive: Auto workers facing unemployment and take-back contracts. Youth threatened with the draft. Women fighting for the Equal Rights Amendment and abortion rights. Blacks under siege by racist killers.

Everyone has a stake in this fight.

Supporting the miners should become a top priority for all working people. And above all, for the industrial unions, which have a big stake in stopping the push to expand nonunion coal. The employers want a "union-free environment." The miners want to preserve and strengthen their union.

The miners' determination is helping inspire resistance to the employer-government ripoff of working people.

The Railway Labor Executives Association, comprising all the major rail unions, has called protest demonstrations for April 29 in Washington, D.C., and other cities against the administration's move to cut funds for Conrail.

Every union member, every victim of budget cuts, every opponent of racism, and every supporter of the miners should join the rail workers in Washington.

All out for the miners! All out April 29!

Socialist Suit—A Challenge to U.S. Government Spying

By Janice Lynn

The landmark lawsuit of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) against U.S. government spy operations opened in New York April 2.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and other U.S. government agencies are on trial for their illegal acts against the socialists.

The lawsuit, begun in July 1973, demands \$40 million in damages for more than forty years of government spying and harassment and an injunction to halt any further illegal government activity against the SWP and YSA.

"In our trial we are fighting not only for our own rights," declared SWP National Secretary Jack Barnes at a courthouse press conference on the opening day of the trial, "but for the rights of all working people—the miners now on strike against the coal operators, the people of El Salvador fighting for their right to run their country, and the Americans who do not want another Vietnam."

The socialists are asking the judge to rule that their political ideas—the advocacy of socialism—and their political activities to achieve that goal are protected by the Bill of Rights.

The U.S. government argues that it has a right to "legally investigate individuals or organizations regardless of their nature."

In an opening statement, SWP attorney Margaret Winter charged that the U.S. government has been "engaged in a conspiracy, whose explicit purpose has been to silence the plaintiffs [the SWP and YSA], suppress their ideas, and disrupt their activities."

Winter pointed to the type of illegal and disruptive methods used by the U.S. government: informers, electronic surveillance, the interception of mail and examination of trash, known as mail and trash "covers," burglaries, blacklisting, the secret copying and examination of private correspondence, documents, records, and more.

She also charged that an especially destructive part of the U.S. government's conspiracy to disrupt and limit the growth of the SWP and YSA was its campaign to stigmatize the socialists as "subversive" and falsely brand them as "terrorists."

The first two witnesses at the trial were Farrell Dobbs, a founding member of the SWP and party national secretary until 1972, and Jack Barnes, SWP national secretary from 1972 to the present.

Both Dobbs and Barnes testified on the nature, goals, and activities of the SWP. They also focused on the socialists' interna-

tional work and the SWP's fraternal relations with the Fourth International and with sister revolutionary parties in countries like Grenada, Nicaragua, and Cuba. Barnes and Dobbs explained the need for international collaboration of working people worldwide.

International Fight Against Political Police

The SWP and YSA suit against the U.S. government's secret police is part of the political history of the international workers movement.

Every capitalist government uses secret police against the working class in an attempt to prevent it from organizing and expressing itself politically.

This has been true from the beginning of the working class's entry on the political scene. In 1848, the early working class movement in Germany, led by Marx and Engels, had to wage a fight against frame-ups of leaders of the Communist League.

The Cologne trial of 1852 revealed that many of the very same secret police methods that are used today were prevalent then: accusations of illegal conspiracy based solely on political ideas and activities, false testimony of informers, and even mail covers and police forgeries.

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the German Social Democratic Party had to fight against the Anti-Socialist Laws for the right to function openly as a legal party.

And the Bolshevik Party and the entire Russian workers movement had to fight against the tsar's FBI—the Okhrana—which had an army of some 40,000 informers inside the working-class movement.

The SWP and YSA fight against political police is an integral part of the long tradition of struggle by the labor movement in the United States. It is part of the struggle of U.S. workers to win the right to organize trade unions, fight for their rights, and form their own political party.

For example, there was the national campaign against the 1886 execution of the Haymarket martyrs—victimized for the actions of a police agent during a workers' demonstration in Chicago for the eight-hour day; the crusade by the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) to establish their right to free speech; the fight against the arrest, trial, and imprisonment of the working-class, antiwar fighter Eugene V. Debs during World War I; and the fight against the anticommunist and anti-immigrant witch-hunts and deportations in 1920, known as the Palmer Raids.

The struggle against the secret police is

also part and parcel of the struggle against U.S. imperialism. With the entry of the United States into World War II, the U.S. government needed a more extensive secret police apparatus.

As the U.S. imperialists prepared for war, they needed to stifle any opposition at home. Thus they went on an offensive against the working class.

Their aim was to silence all opponents of their war drive, channel all motion toward a labor party back into the two capitalist parties, and try to make working people accept the need to sacrifice for the war. So the U.S. rulers expanded the FBI to go after the unions. This began around 1938—the same year the SWP was founded.

In Minneapolis, Minnesota, Teamsters Local 544 was the spearhead of labor organization in the entire Northwest. Its leaders—who included members of the SWP—refused to abandon their struggle to improve working conditions despite the impending entry of the United States into World War II.

The government needed to isolate and silence such opponents. And in 1941, twenty-eight leaders of the Minneapolis Teamsters and the Socialist Workers Party became the first victims of a thought-control law passed the year before, known as the Smith Act. Eighteen of them were convicted and imprisoned during 1944-45 for mere advocacy of their ideas. The SWP was singled out because of its determined defense of union democracy and its opposition to Washington's imperialist designs in the war.

During this time, passports were denied to SWP leaders in an attempt to disrupt not only the SWP, but the Fourth International. The SWP was prevented from presenting its point of view and hearing what others had to say. Reactionary legislation passed in 1940—the Voorhis Act—forced the SWP to sever formal ties with the Fourth International, but fraternal and collaborative relations were maintained.

Antilabor Offensive Intensifies

After World War II, U.S. imperialism began to replace British and French imperialism in countries throughout the world—in Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America. U.S. imperialism began to play a larger and larger role on a world scale—trying to halt colonial revolutions and shoring up ruling classes in Europe.

Consequently, the U.S. rulers had to step up their antilabor and anticommunist offensive at home. As an extension of their imperialist role internationally, a cold war witch-hunt campaign was begun, led by Sen. Jo-

seph McCarthy. This was the U.S. rulers' domestic expression of moves to contain the workers and national-liberation movements the world over.

In 1948, the Truman administration established an attorney general's list of "subversive organizations"—an official government blacklist. The SWP, along with scores of other groups, appeared on this list from the beginning.

During this period, the SWP fought some defensive battles against victimizations. SWP members were witch-hunted out of the maritime industry and many workers who were members or supporters of the SWP in other industries were fired.

The U.S. government carried out a long, vindictive effort to victimize SWP member James Kutcher, a veteran of World War II who had lost both his legs. But the SWP fought back, mobilizing broad public support. And after a massive, eight-year civil liberties fight Kutcher won the right to be a member of the SWP without losing his job or his veterans' benefits.

But the political climate during the 1950s McCarthy era was not such that it was possible to go on the offensive against the U.S. rulers' witch-hunting campaign. It was in the 1950s that Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were executed on frame-up charges of stealing the "secret" of the atom bomb.

It was only after the imperialist defeat in Vietnam, the end of the long economic expansion, the rise of the civil rights movement, and the revelations that came out of the Watergate scandal that it was possible to launch a political and legal campaign against the U.S. government's secret police.

Socialists Launch Lawsuit

The SWP's decision to launch its lawsuit in 1973 was in the interests of the entire working class. It was based on the shift that was occurring in the relationship of class forces on a world scale.

As a result of the Vietnam war everything had changed. There was massive opposition within the United States to the sending of U.S. troops to crush national liberation struggles. And there were tactical divisions within the U.S. ruling class about pursuing the Vietnam war in the midst of this growing opposition.

The lies about Vietnam, followed by the lies and cover-ups about Watergate, resulted in a deep crisis of confidence in the U.S. government on the part of American working people. As a result of the Watergate disclosures, there was widespread distrust of the methods of capitalist rule—the use of secret police, informers, agents provocateurs, frame-ups, disruption efforts, etc.

It was in the context of this changing political situation that the SWP and YSA launched their suit.

The SWP and YSA lawsuit against government spying has been effective in exposing the true face of capitalist rule and showing that it was the workers movement that was the real target of the U.S. govern-



Socialist plaintiffs, supporters, and attorneys outside courthouse on opening day of trial of U.S. government. Harry Ring/Militant

ment's secret police.

Through this suit, it was possible to bring out into the open the methods used by political police, even under a bourgeois democracy. The Watergate disclosures merely revealed a portion of the U.S. government's secret police operations.

The extensive use of secret political police in the United States, which is supposed to be among the most democratic of capitalist regimes, shows that this type of massive, undercover repressive machine is not just restricted to police-states, brutal dictatorships, or fascist rule. Rather, it is part of the content of capitalist rule, no matter what its form.

Questions were raised at the time whether using the bourgeois courts would only serve to promote illusions in the U.S. judicial system. The fact of the matter is that some of the best and most effective propaganda has been made by revolutionary fighters from the courtroom. Karl Marx, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Leon Trotsky, Rosa Luxemburg, James P. Cannon, and Fidel Castro are just a few examples.

The courtroom can be used effectively to expose the false nature of American democracy before an audience of millions. And most importantly, it can serve as a forum from which to reach working people with socialist ideas—the ideas the U.S. government wants to suppress.

Even before the suit went to trial, it succeeded in obtaining considerable press coverage, which helped expose before American working people how the capitalist class really rules. It showed how the ruling class seeks to maintain itself in power by resorting to the use of paid informers, illegal wiretaps, burglaries, and other equally unconstitutional methods.

Exposure of FBI and CIA Crimes

The SWP and YSA lawsuit played a central role in uncovering many of the crimes of the FBI, CIA, and other government spy agencies within the United States. The suit

forced the U.S. government to release tens of thousands of pages of hitherto secret documents.

Among other revelations, the SWP and YSA lawsuit uncovered:

- Documented proof of FBI burglaries (ninety-two burglaries alone of the SWP national office in New York between 1960 and 1966);
- Extensive spying directed not only against the SWP, but against the Black, antiwar, women's, and Chicano movements;
- FBI visits to landlords, employers, and relatives—leading to the loss of jobs and housing;
- The use of hundreds of informers to spy on people, steal records, and instigate provocations;
- Bugging telephones;
- Using bomb threats and physical violence;
- The existence of an "SWP Disruption Program"—a specific government program started in 1961 to spy on and try to disrupt the legitimate political activities of the SWP and YSA.

The documents also showed how the FBI plotted against the Black movement, how it tried to drive union militants from their jobs, and how it tried to prevent the rise of the massive movement against the Vietnam war. And they revealed how immigration laws have been used to single out non-citizen members and supporters of the SWP and YSA on purely political grounds.

Documents have disclosed how the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) maintains a blacklist used to harass, exclude, and deport non-U.S. citizens. It was shown how the INS acts in collusion with secret police of foreign governments, including South Africa, and has had a special relationship with police agencies in Canada and Mexico.

INS files have proven that INS attempts to deport SWP and YSA member Héctor Marroquín to Mexico were solely on the basis of his political ideas.

Another socialist, Marian Bustin, a coal miner and native of Scotland, has also been the victim of an INS investigation because of her political views.

The SWP and YSA lawsuit brought to light many of the U.S. government's international operations. In 1976 the CIA was forced to hand over to the socialists hundreds of documents on its secret operations around the world. Although this was only a small portion of its massive file on the world Trotskyist movement and was heavily censored, what emerged was a vast campaign to disrupt and destroy the Fourth International.

The CIA documents disclosed that:

- CIA burglars carried out break-ins and used electronic surveillance against SWP and YSA members traveling abroad.

- Letters and other mail to and from the American Trotskyists were opened and copied.

- Information on the SWP and YSA was both given to and received from foreign governments.

- And there was a CIA admission that it "has engaged in the collection of information concerning the Fourth International."

The lawsuit demands that the U.S. courts forbid the government from spying on and attempting to disrupt the SWP, the YSA, and the Fourth International anywhere in the world.

In its document submitted to the court, the SWP and YSA affirmed that since disaffiliating with the Fourth International following the passage of the Voorhis Act, the SWP and YSA "have continued to express their political support to the Fourth International, to openly play a leadership role in the Fourth International's discussions, and to participate in meetings and congresses of the Fourth International with the right to speak and cast consultative votes on all questions. . . ."

CIA Assassinations and Coups

In 1975-76—in response to the growing public questioning of U.S. government methods following Watergate—the U.S. rulers opted for letting some of the truth come out, so as to try to cut short independent disclosures and refurbish their political police.

Some of the most sordid crimes of the CIA began to emerge—assassinations, reactionary coups all over the world, "destabilization" operations, payoffs and bribes to corrupt politicians and bloody dictators.

In the 1960s the CIA had actually tried to arrange the assassination of Cuban President Fidel Castro, even recruiting Mafia hitmen for the job. And for years, Washington continued to send in CIA teams to Cuba who would burn crops and sabotage industrial projects.

It was also revealed that the U.S. government sets up phony CIA-backed union federations and labor publications in countries throughout the world, disrupting genuine attempts to organize workers.

Documents that were brought to light in

this period also disclosed how U.S. agents have attempted to subvert the principle of freedom of the press, bribing newspaper editors and reporters and planting doctored articles in the world press.

The documents showed how the U.S. government has aided some of the world's most vicious dictatorial regimes. And when the CIA was unable to buy off governments it resorted to bringing about their forcible overthrow—as in Iran in 1953, Guatemala in 1954, the Congo in the early 1960s, and in Chile in 1973, just to name a few.

The initiative taken by the SWP and YSA lawsuit played a central role in helping to force out into the open many of the practices of the FBI and CIA.

And one of the main contributions of the suit was to inspire other victims of the government's secret police to fight back—especially leaders of the Black movement in the United States who were singled out for victimization by U.S. secret police operations.

Since the filing of the SWP and YSA lawsuit, it has been revealed that:

- The FBI hounded and tried to defame civil rights leader Martin Luther King, Jr.

- The FBI had vowed to eliminate Malcolm X.

- FBI informer Gary Rowe was involved with the racist murder squad that gunned down civil rights worker Viola Liuzzo in 1965.

- The FBI was directly implicated in the 1969 murderous police raid on the Black Panthers in Chicago, Illinois, where Black Panther Party leader Fred Hampton was murdered as he lay sleeping in his bed.

Documents have proven how the FBI has also waged a war of disruption against the Chicano and American Indian movements and how they targeted the women's liberation movement for disruption.

The SWP and YSA lawsuit also showed the close connection between the methods and aims of U.S. imperialism internationally and its methods and aims against opponents of imperialism and capitalism in the United States. If the U.S. government was conspiring to assassinate Cuban President Fidel Castro, it followed that the government would do whatever they could get away with doing to the defenders of the Cuban revolution in the United States.

Changing Political Situation

Today, eight years after the SWP and YSA suit was first launched, the political situation has evolved.

The deepening economic crisis has begun to change the way many workers are looking at the government. More and more American workers are beginning to recognize that the U.S. government and its Democratic and Republican parties are on the side of the employers in driving down the living standards of workers, attacking trade unions, reversing gains made by minorities and women, and preparing for military intervention abroad.

As more and more workers begin to adopt

more radical ideas and more militant forms of struggle, the employers must increasingly rely on repression.

There is more frequent use of cops to intimidate striking workers, greater use of injunctions to break strikes, more cop murders of Black and Latino youth, and stepped-up use of the secret police network against the unions, Black organizations, and socialist groups.

The decision by members of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) to reject a contract proposal and go out on strike against the coal operators is a significant indication of the changing moods in the working class.

The UMWA is at the center of resistance to the U.S. rulers' assault on working people. They have led the way in the fight against cutbacks, in the fight against nuclear power, and now are in the forefront of the battle to defend industrial unions.

Similarly, tens of thousands of Black rights activists have demonstrated in cities throughout the United States to protest the unsolved, racist murders in Atlanta, Georgia.

Working people have also been inspired by the new rise in the world revolution. Demonstrations, rallies, and meetings in solidarity with the struggle of the people of El Salvador have attracted tens of thousands over the last months.

Following the victory of the Vietnamese revolution, there have been some important new victories—in Nicaragua, Iran, Grenada, Kampuchea—where the masses have risen up to challenge the imperialist stranglehold on their countries.

As a result, the U.S. rulers are forced to take measures to protect their imperialist interests abroad. They are threatening El Salvador in order to try to prevent any further advances of workers and peasants throughout the world.

But in order to do this, they have to stem the tide of rising opposition at home to their unpopular policies of driving forward to war and making working people pay for the capitalist crisis. There are more and more attempts to restrict fundamental rights—the right to speak, assemble, and organize freely.

The U.S. government needs its secret police network more than ever if they are to thwart the workers' fightback.

But opposition is not dying down. Just the opposite. It is growing, as the labor movement, antidraft activists, fighters for Black rights, and others continue to assert their rights to demonstrate and organize against Reagan's policies.

The SWP and YSA lawsuit is an important part of this opposition, challenging the U.S. government's claim that it has the legal right to spy on, harass, blacklist, and deport anyone whose political views it disapproves of.

The SWP and YSA lawsuit is forcing the government to come out and say what it really believes—that it would like to ban all

groups and parties for merely holding and speaking about their revolutionary ideas. It is dusting off its thought-control laws and working on new legislation in order to do this.

In its response to the trial plan of the SWP and YSA, the U.S. government admitted that many facts of the FBI's and CIA's harassment and illegal actions are undisputed. But, the government states, "The issue in this case is not whether the SWP, the YSA, or any of their members can be proved guilty of a crime beyond a reasonable doubt. The issue is whether the Government has a right to keep itself informed of the activities of groups that openly advocate revolutionary change in the structure and leadership of the Government of the United States, even if such advocacy might be within the letter of the law."

The SWP and YSA openly assert their ad-

vocacy of revolutionary change in U.S. society. "The purpose of the plaintiff organizations," the SWP and YSA outlined in their court document, "is to educate and organize the working class to establish a workers government in order to abolish capitalism and achieve socialism."

But the U.S. government tries to say that just advocacy of such ideas is illegal—despite the fact that in their more than forty-year investigation of the SWP and YSA the U.S. government has not uncovered a single crime or any plan to commit any crime.

The U.S. government labels the socialists "subversive." This is the same label they use for Blacks and Latinos struggling for their rights, opponents of U.S. military intervention around the world, and workers who go on strike. In this way, the U.S. rulers think they can get away with claiming they have the right to spy on, harass, and prosecute

these working class fighters.

The SWP and YSA lawsuit is challenging all this.

Whatever the final outcome of the trial, the lawsuit has played an historic role in exposing for millions of working people how the government targets working class militants and fighters of the oppressed nationalities, asserting its authority to investigate anyone who dissents from its policies.

The lawsuit's role in helping to undermine the government's ability to rule by deception cannot be underestimated.

The SWP and YSA lawsuit represents an important fightback against the U.S. government's policies and for the political rights of all working people.

A victory would be a victory for every unionist, Black activist, fighter for women's rights, and opponent of the U.S. government's policies. □

Court Testimony of SWP Leader Farrell Dobbs

'We Are Based on the Fundamental Doctrines of Marxism'

[The following are excerpts from the direct examination of Farrell Dobbs, a former national secretary of the U.S. Socialist Workers Party (SWP), on April 2, 1981, the first day of the trial of the U.S. government.

[Conducting the direct examination was Margaret Winter, chief counsel for the socialists. Judge Thomas Griesa was presiding. The testimony is taken from the official court transcript.]

* * *

Winter. What organizations, socialist organizations, have you been a member of?

Dobbs. I joined the Communist League of America in March of 1934. I remained a member of that organization until right at the end of 1934; it fused with an organization known as the American Workers Party, and the fused forces formed what was called the Workers Party of the United States.

I was a member of the Workers Party of the United States until it was dissolved in 1936. The dissolution came about because the Workers Party decided to enter the Socialist Party of the United States and secured the agreement of the Socialist Party to do so.

I became a member of the Socialist Party in those circumstances and part of the left wing of that party. I remained in the Socialist Party until about the end of 1937, when the left wing was expelled and the Socialist Workers Party was founded.

Griesa. What was the difference that they perceived between the teachings of



FARRELL DOBBS

Trotsky and the policies of Stalin?

Dobbs. Basically, the differences can be summed up briefly as follows, in my judgment:

Stalin had advanced the theory of socialism in one country; that is, that the Soviet Union would concentrate on trying to continue with the building of a socialist society in Russia and that the struggles to establish socialism in other countries would be subordinated to that.

Trotsky took the view that socialism could not be defended in the Soviet Union.

The socialist property forms, or the progressive property forms, that were created after the Russian Revolution that laid the foundations for building toward a socialist society could not be defended in one country alone.

Ultimately, either the change would have to be worldwide, or the capitalistic forces elsewhere in the world would be able to crush the Soviet Union and restore the capitalist property forms that had been abolished.

Winter. When the SWP was founded in 1938, did it have a relationship to any international political organization?

Dobbs. At the time of the founding of the Socialist Workers Party at the beginning of 1938, it proceeded as a participant in what had started as the International Left Opposition back in 1928, and had evolved by this time into a committee—into a formation for the Fourth International.

During 1938, some months after the Socialist Workers Party was founded, the Fourth International was founded. The Socialist Workers Party became one of the founding sections of the organization.

Griesa. The Fourth International is in contrast to the Third International?

Dobbs: Yes, that is correct.

Griesa. What is the Third International?

Dobbs. The Third International was launched in 1919, after the Russian Revolution.

Would it help you, sir, if I sort of gave

you a little sketch?

Griese. I just want to know, the Third International, did that become Stalinist?

Dobbs. It did.

Griese. That is why there was a Fourth International, to follow the teachings of Trotsky. Is that right?

Dobbs. Yes.

Winter. Is the SWP based on any particular political doctrines?

Dobbs. Yes, yes. We are based on the fundamental doctrines of Marxism—referred to as scientific socialism.

Winter. Can you briefly describe what those doctrines are?

Dobbs. That is a large question but I'll try very hard to do it very briefly. Just the bare bones fundamentals is what I'll try very briefly to outline.

The Marxist outlook is based on recognition of the fact that throughout class society, from the days of slavery in olden times through the stage of feudal society to the contemporary capitalist system, that the motive force of history has been a struggle between the exploiting classes on one side and the exploited classes on the other—between the oppressors on one side and the oppressed on the other.

In capitalist society, this struggle in the scientific socialistic view has its roots in the capitalist system of property relations. Capitalists hold the social means of production as private property that they seek to use to advance their own private interests at the expense of the general social welfare.

Commodities produced under the capitalist system are produced through the employment of wage labor by the capitalists. The value of the commodities produced represents the socially necessary labor that is congealed in the produced commodity.

A contest arises over the division between the capitalists on the one side and the workers on the other over this value. The capitalists—I am not speaking of individuals, but in general terms as a class—try to hold down the workers' share of the value produced to only that which is necessary for the subsistence of the working class and for its procreation.

The working class, on the other hand, is not content merely to subsist and to procreate. The working class aspires to advance toward an ever-improved state of life. This gives rise to an unending clash between the capitalist and the working class in contemporary society in this country. I'll just say in passing you have an example in the fact that the coal miners are on strike today.

The Marxist view is that the contradictions that lead to this condition are inher-

ent in the capitalist form of property relations. The needs and the interests of the working class cannot therefore be solved under the capitalist system. It is necessary to abolish private property in the social means of production.

Winter. What does the SWP mean when it uses the word "revolution"?

Dobbs. In speaking of revolution, the term is used in the context that it is used generally in political science, whether it is socialist political science or capitalist political science. A revolution in political terminology relates only to a fundamental transformation in basic processes.

For example, within the historic era of capitalism, a tremendous leap took place in the forms of production through what was called the Industrial Revolution that began in England back in the 18th Century. Basically, machine production was introduced after the invention of the en-

gine, and it permitted an increasingly accelerating transformation from production by hand and with manual tools and so on to the machine form of production. That opened up whole new vistas for both qualitative and quantitative advancement in industrial output. That is why it was called a revolution.

When we speak of a revolution in the political sense, that is what we mean. A qualitative transformation from one basic form of social structure, capitalism, to a different basic form of social structure that we call socialism.

Winter. Does the SWP have any view on whether the revolution that you talked about a few minutes ago must be accomplished by violence?

Dobbs. Yes.

Winter. What is this view?

Dobbs. Our view is this: It would be best

Wide Support for Socialist Suit

Support for the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) lawsuit against U.S. government spying has been organized by the Political Rights Defense Fund (PRDF).

An impressive array of civil rights leaders; Black and Latino community figures; union officials; writers, artists, and entertainment personalities; feminists; civil liberties fighters; and others are backing the socialists' fight for political rights.

Below are excerpts from some of the recent statements received by PRDF to mark the opening of the trial:

Douglas Fraser
President, United Auto Workers

"In a free society, political parties and their members should not be spied upon and harassed by government agencies."

Gloria Steinem
Feminist leader and editor of *Ms.* magazine

"The FBI's abridgement of Constitutional rights to political freedom was a potential danger to us all. We owe the Socialist Workers Party a debt of gratitude for making this struggle on our behalf."

Ronald Dellums, John Conyers, Gus Savage
Members of U.S. Congressional Black Caucus

"We join with thousands of concerned voices in calling upon the Attorney General to end all illegal practices

against the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance."

Alice Peurla
President, United Steelworkers of America, Local 65, Chicago, Illinois

"As a longtime activist in the labor movement and the civil rights movement, I feel strongly that all political organizations must have the absolute right to function in a free society."

Rafael Cancel Miranda
One of the five Puerto Rican nationalists released from prison in 1979

"As a Puerto Rican who defends the rights of my people I support the suit of the Socialist Workers Party against the repressive agencies of the FBI and CIA. This fight is of concern to all of us."

Robert and Michael Meeropol
Sons of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg

"This court house holds special meaning for us. Here our parents were framed in a caricature of a trial for 'stealing' the non-existent secret of the atom bomb. Here they were sentenced to death.

"The trial that opens today should be watched carefully by all of our fellow citizens. It will reveal that once you give government agencies the right to determine who is and who is not worthy of Bill of Rights protections, then they will use that power to protect themselves from public scrutiny and criticism, and seek to rig the political process so that minority views do not get a fair hearing."

and we would welcome the carrying through of the fundamental changes in a peaceful and orderly manner in keeping with the operation of the democratic principle of majority rule.

We take into account, however, in speaking on this subject, that historically there has been a tendency on the part of privileged ruling classes—from slave society through feudal society to contemporary times—for the privileged class that has private ownership of the means of production to resist by force and violence the attempt of a majority of the population to bring about a social change in which their special privileges would be stripped from them.

And therefore, it follows, as we see it, that while first a majority must be convinced that there is a need to bring about a fundamental social change, there is always the possibility that the majority will then have to defend its decision against—

Griese. The majority must defend its decision, you say?

Dobbs. That the majority may have to defend and uphold its decision against an attempt by a privileged ruling class minority to subvert the majority will through force and violence.

Winter. Mr. Dobbs, to your knowledge, has the SWP's relationship to the Fourth International changed since the SWP was founded in 1938?

Dobbs. It has not changed in a political sense, but there was a change in an organizational aspect.

Winter. When did the organizational change that you referred to occur?

Dobbs. In December of 1940.

Winter. Can you describe this organizational change?

Dobbs. Yes. The Socialist Workers Party disaffiliated organizationally from the Fourth International and thereafter did not pay dues to the Fourth International, and did not cast decisive votes on any political views of the Fourth International.

Griese. When was that changed?

Dobbs. December of 1940.

Griese. You disaffiliated from the Fourth International, did not pay dues; is that right?

Dobbs. That is right. And did not cast a decisive vote in any political deliberations of the Fourth International.

Winter. Mr. Dobbs, was the decision to disaffiliate made in any formal gathering of the party?

Dobbs. Yes. A special convention of the

party was held in December of 1940, at which the disaffiliation was decided upon.

Winter. What reasons, if any, were discussed at the convention for disaffiliating?

Dobbs. The circumstances thrust upon us by the Voorhis law, which was enacted a short time before the convention was held.

Winter. Can you explain why the SWP viewed the passage of the Voorhis Act as a reason for seeking not to pay dues and for not casting votes in the Fourth International?

Dobbs. The Voorhis Act, as I recall, did not in itself forbid international affiliation. But it did require [any group] affiliated with an international organization to register all of its members and their addresses with the Department of Justice.

By that time we were already having such experience with harassment from the FBI that we felt that it would merely make it all the harder for the party members if we made such a registration. So we decided instead to disaffiliate organizationally from the Fourth International so that we would not have to register.

Winter. Did the SWP make public the fact that it had disaffiliated?

Dobbs. Yes, we did. We made that fact public and stated that we were disaffiliating because of the circumstances imposed upon us by the Voorhis Act. And we denounced the Voorhis Act as an undemocratic, unconstitutional law in our opinion.

Winter. To your knowledge, did the SWP lessen its political work with the Fourth International after disaffiliation?

Dobbs. No.

Winter. After the SWP disaffiliated, SWP members continued to participate in activities or meetings of the Fourth International?

Dobbs. Not all SWP members. From time to time one or the other person of the SWP would sit in at political deliberation held by the Fourth International.

In doing so, expressing the party's view about whatever political question was under discussion, we sought also to keep the entire membership of the party fully informed about the political life of the Fourth International—the issues under consideration, the views expressed, the differences of opinion that arose, and so on.

Winter. Can you explain a little bit more fully the nature of the SWP's participation and activities of the Fourth International?

Dobbs. In terms of political activity, the SWP always expressed its views. It did not hesitate to take initiative, even in consulta-

tions with the cadres of the Fourth International, in expressing its views and taking initiatives and raising a new question that had to be discussed or to advance a position about a given question under discussion.

We tried to be a continuing part of political deliberations within the international Trotskyist movement.

Winter. Was this participation in the Fourth International any different in substance before disaffiliating and after?

Dobbs. No, it was not.

Winter. To your knowledge, Mr. Dobbs, has the SWP ever attempted in any way to mask its relations with the Fourth International?

Dobbs. Not at all. We have been very public about all of this.

Winter. Mr. Dobbs, does the SWP have any views on who will start the revolution in the United States?

Dobbs. Oh, yes. Yes, we do.

Winter. Could you explain what those views are.

Dobbs. Only when a majority of the population, headed by the working class, decides that it is necessary to make a revolutionary change in the social system of this country will a struggle start to bring about such a change.

Winter. Is it your testimony, then, that this revolution will not be started by a minority?

Dobbs. No. A minority cannot carry through a revolution. We firmly believe, on the basis of the whole record of history, that the only way a fundamental social change can be brought about is by the action of a majority of the population. A minority cannot bring about a fundamental social change.

Winter. Has the SWP ever, to your knowledge, taken the position that the SWP will start the revolution?

Dobbs. No, we have not. We advocate the goals that we think such a revolutionary change should strive toward. We do everything we can to educate people of the need to move in that direction. But neither the Socialist Workers Party nor any other party is going to start a revolution. Neither the Socialist Workers Party nor any other party is going to impose itself upon the working class as the leaders of the revolution.

Those things will be decided by the working class itself, and by nobody else.

You won't miss a single issue if you subscribe.

How Sandinistas Won Over the Nicaraguan Farmers

By Matilde Zimmermann

MANAGUA—"We know that the revolutionary government is on our side, and is going to listen to us and help solve our problems. And from this day on, we are not going to believe the stories about the government taking away our land and our livestock."

The speaker was Isabel Soto, representing small cattle ranchers in the mining area of northeast Nicaragua. The occasion was the fifth regional assembly of the Asociación de Pequeños y Medianos Productores (Association of Small and Medium Farmers), March 22. The assembly drew together farmers and ranchers from the vast, largely undeveloped, and sparsely populated province of Zelaya. Some had traveled five days to attend the meeting.

The newest and fastest-growing of the Sandinista mass organizations, the Association of Small and Medium Farmers represents the interests of more than 100,000 Nicaraguan families who work small plots of land. This dynamic new organization is already helping to strengthen the alliance between workers and peasants that forms the central axis of the Sandinista concept of national unity.

In the three months since the farmers first began to be organized, meetings of hundreds of campesinos have taken place in towns and villages all over Nicaragua. A total of about 10,000 have attended five big regional assemblies. A national conference is planned for the end of April, after which the new organization is expected to ask for representation in the Council of State.

Nicaragua is an agricultural country. Half the population lives in the countryside, and fully two-thirds is involved in one way or another in agricultural production or processing.

A Major Role in Economy

The overwhelming majority of agricultural producers have small or medium-sized holdings. Some of the plots are very small indeed. According to 1971 figures, more than 40 percent of all producers owned or rented less than 10 manzanas each (1 manzana = 1.73 acres). Less than 2 percent, only 200 individuals, fell into the category of big producers, with 500 manzanas or more of land. (The large holdings that belonged to the ex-dictator Somoza and his family have since been nationalized.)

The category of family farmers and small ranchers, represented by the new organization, is responsible for the production of almost all basic foodstuffs in Nicaragua. Small farmers grow 95 to 100 percent of all beans and corn and only slightly less of the rice. In addition they account for a signifi-

cant amount of the production of two important exports—coffee and beef.

The life of a Nicaraguan farmer has long been one of social and economic deprivation—hunger, poverty, disease, insecurity. At the time of the Nicaraguan revolution twenty months ago, 68 percent of the rural population could not read or write. Ninety-four percent did not have safe drinking water. According to Agrarian Reform Minister Jaime Wheelock, of every thousand babies born in rural areas, 200 died at birth and another 200 before their fifth birthday.

The Somoza family, which ruled Nicaragua for half a century, pursued a conscious policy of favoring the big growers (often Somoza's friends or relatives) at the expense of small farmers. Small farmers were robbed of the most productive land in the 1950s to make room for huge cotton plantations. Many became landless agricultural workers. Others retreated to small plots of poor, hilly land, and were forced to pick cotton during the harvest to make ends meet. Everything they did not owe to the big growers, they owed to the banks.

Already eking out only a marginal existence, the small farmers and ranchers suffered losses during the civil war of 1978-79. Cattle meant for breeding were slaughtered and seed grain eaten to avoid starvation.

The new revolutionary government that came to power on July 19, 1979, began to try to deal with some of the problems of the poor farmers. A special priority was put on reestablishing the production of basic foodstuffs to deal with severe shortages. Within the limits of the country's tight economic situation, special programs were established to provide credit, technical assistance, and emergency aid. Peasants were encouraged to join together in service, marketing, and credit cooperatives.

The small farmers have been a mainstay of Nicaragua's economic reactivation plan. While many big growers have been dragging their heels, sometimes refusing to invest or plant, campesinos have worked hard to reestablish and even surpass pre-war production levels.

One illustration of this difference in attitude is an incident that occurred in early March in the coffee-growing area of Jinotega. Small coffee growers revealed to the press that some large plantations had been virtually abandoned, and they took reporters and photographers to see areas overgrown with weeds and fast reverting to jungle. The campesinos noted that production on these large holdings was down to a fraction of what it had been the year before, and denounced this as unpatriotic behavior in a

country that so badly needs the foreign exchange coffee brings.

Need Own Organization

The Association of Small and Medium Farmers is not the first attempt to involve small farmers in the political life of the country. The initial approach of the Sandinista government was to include both landless agricultural workers and small farmers in a single organization, the Rural Workers Association (ATC).

But the problems and needs of small farmers and ranchers are quite different from those of salaried workers on a cotton or banana plantation—even if the same individual in many cases goes back and forth from one category to the other.

This difference became apparent when the farmers began to meet on their own, to discuss the priorities of the new organization. The big majority of the concerns expressed at meetings and assemblies around the country—loans for planting, cattle theft, crop transport and marketing, technical assistance—were peculiar to small farmers and not problems shared with rural wage workers.

The small farmers needed their own organization. As long as they did not have a direct link with the revolutionary government, the farmers could easily be confused by the propaganda of the big capitalist growers on whom they had always been dependent.

This theme was sounded over and over again in meetings. Farmers complained of being bombarded with stories that the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) was out to steal their lands, their religion, and their children.

"In the mountains," said Miguel González from Chontales, "reactionary elements go around saying that the government is going to tax small farmers for every chair and pig and hut we own, and that then it is going to take away our lands besides." González had an answer: "The best response we can make to these maneuvers is to organize ourselves. Now we realize that we have to form our own bloc."

Problems of the Farmers

The problems highlighted at dozens of meetings of farmers and the "plans of action" that emerged from the regional assemblies give a picture of the difficult life of Nicaraguan farmers today.

The most common concern was one familiar to land-holding farmers everywhere: credit. Since the revolution, the small farmers have the option of borrowing from the

state-owned National Development Bank, instead of falling deeper and deeper into debt—and eventually turning over their land—to the big growers. This of course does not automatically solve the problem of debt service, especially given the extremely small size and low productivity of most of the farms. But this was one area in which the government was able to provide some immediate relief in terms of loan opportunities and repayment schedules, once the specific problems were outlined in meetings of the farmers' association.

In some parts of northern and eastern Nicaragua, the most critical problem small farmers face is the lack of roads. Under the Somoza dictatorship, roads were built and other types of infrastructure provided only for the big haciendas. Some farmers in the mountains have to transport their produce out by mule or on foot. Crops are lost because they cannot be gotten to market, or producers are forced to deal with speculators and middlemen who pay extremely low prices but provide transportation.

Some improvement has resulted from the construction of cooperative silos where farmers can store their produce until it can be picked up and sold to the state-run marketing agency for a fair price. But road construction is a long-term problem in a relatively large and extremely poor country like Nicaragua.

Since the revolution some big cattle ranchers have simply walked their property across the border into Honduras, a form of capital flight that cost Nicaragua millions of dollars of foreign exchange in 1980. The small ranchers have not participated in this form of economic sabotage, but their cattle have been stolen by bands of rustlers that often include ex-National Guard terrorists based in Honduras.

When the problem of cattle rustling was raised at one of the first meetings of the farmers' association, FSLN leader Victor Tizado immediately proposed the formation of voluntary armed patrols. A stiff new law against cattle theft was passed in early February in direct response to the complaints of the small ranchers. The need to protect their own herds has provided added incentive for small ranchers to join the Sandinista People's Militias. As one owner of thirty-five cows told the FSLN daily *Barricada*, "With a rifle in our hands, we are prepared to raise production."

Protecting Tenant Farmers

Another area in which the Sandinista government has responded quickly to the concerns of small farmers is in legal protection for tenant farmers. In 1976 only 58,000 of the 102,000 agricultural producers owned their own land. Twenty-four thousand rented the land they worked—five-sixths of these had tiny plots of less than five manzanas. Most of the remainder worked under other forms of land tenancy such as sharecropping.

The tenant farmers lived with the fear

that the big landowners would refuse to rent to them again at the end of each crop cycle. In fact, many were threatened with eviction from their land if they joined the new farmers' association.

On March 17 the Government of National Reconstruction passed a new law that guarantees the right of tenants to renew their leases on all lands they actually have in production. If landowners refuse to comply, the government can step in and rent the land to the tenant. An earlier decree had established the maximum annual rent for non-cotton-producing land at 100 cordobas per manzana (10 cordobas = US\$1).

Many of the complaints and suggestions raised at the farmers' assemblies had to do with the functioning of the various state agencies they deal with—credit agencies, suppliers, marketing facilities. Some frank criticisms were made.

While clamoring for more technical assistance, for example, the farmers expressed nothing but scorn for technicians who sit at their desks and never go into a field.

Professionals trained during the time of Somoza learned to attach more importance to prestige and pay than to raising production, and not all have been able to overcome such elitist ideas. As a leader of the farmers' association in Matagalpa told us, "It is very hard to make a Sandinista out of a technician. Sometimes it's quicker to make a technician out of a Sandinista."

Many of the concrete suggestions made at the farmers' meetings could never have come out of an office in Managua. They could only come from the day-to-day life of the campesinos themselves.

Democracy in the Countryside

It is clear from all the meetings that have taken place so far that the Association of Small and Medium Farmers is a real organization that working farmers and ranchers feel belongs to them and represents their interests. The impulse for the organization and its rapid growth have come from the farmers themselves.

In elections at every meeting and assembly, the farmers have begun putting forward their own leaders. This is one of the best examples of the tremendous expansion of democracy in Nicaragua since the revolution. One coffee grower described the Matagalpa regional assembly of 2,000 persons this way:

"What happened in Matagalpa was an open election. The people who were there were not some fat cats who once stole someone's machete so they could pretend to work the land and pass themselves off as our representatives. The people who were there know what it takes to make the land produce, and they are really representing themselves. And we are going to extend this process further."

One of the reasons the new association is so democratic is that it is based on the premise that the small and medium farmers have interests of their own that are different from those of the big capitalist growers.

This does not mean that the category of small and medium farmers is completely homogeneous. It ranges from the tenant farmer who scratches out a crop on a couple of manzanas and works for a wage every harvest, to the farmer or rancher who supplements family labor by hiring a few workers for at least part of the year. There are variations in technological and social development in different parts of the country.

Small Farmers vs. Agribusiness

But these differences are less important than the line that separates these farmers from the agribusinessmen who own virtual factories in the fields, sometimes employing thousands of workers.

This line implies political differences as well as different standards of living. As government member Sergio Ramirez told a group of campesino leaders in early March: "None of you go running off to foreign embassies to get your orders. We haven't seen any of you leave the country to slander the revolution. None of you go running around opening bank accounts in Miami."

There is no democracy when the only representation a small farmer has is a capitalist grower. Yet this is the situation that always prevailed in Nicaragua before, as it does in every capitalist country. The big growers set up phony "cooperatives" to try to cover up the differences between themselves and the poor farmers. When a "cooperative" includes some people who produce 500 pounds of coffee beans a year and others who produce 100,000, it is not difficult to guess whose interests that "cooperative" is going to represent.

The political organization of capitalist growers, the Union of Agricultural Producers of Nicaragua (UPANIC), claims to represent all agricultural producers. When UPANIC joined the other institutions of big business in walking out of the Council of State in November 1980, its leaders claimed that the majority of the population was involved in the boycott. That myth has been laid to rest by the emergence of the new farmers' organization. Through their three-month organizing drive, small farmers have acquired a new sense of their own numbers and importance, and confidence in their ability to speak for themselves.

At a provincial meeting in the middle of the country, one farmer explained how the Sandinista government had opened up the first possibility for the interests of small farmers to be represented: "This is something new for you to come to us, to ask us what our problems are, what we need. This never happened in the past. The only thing the big guy was ever interested in was screwing the little guy, and that was all."

Blow Against Counterrevolution

The conscious approach the FSLN has taken to winning the farmers to support for the revolution is something that deserves study by working-class leaders in other

countries. The process is not over. But the Sandinistas' success so far, and in particular the growth of the small-farmers' association, has struck a major blow against those who want to turn back the revolution.

Two examples illustrate how this development is affecting the political balance of forces within the country.

When the Reagan administration cut off wheat credits to Nicaragua, it was the small farmers who immediately suggested trying to grow wheat in Nicaragua to reduce the country's dependency.

The farm of Ocotal, near the Honduran border, was one of the places where there was a large and militant Sandinista demonstration March 14 against a procapitalist rally scheduled for the next day. Ocotal had a reputation for being somewhat conservative and apathetic during the revolutionary war. But, just a few weeks before this protest, it had been the scene of by far the largest of the five regional farmers' assemblies.

The Sandinistas' approach consists first of all in understanding that the small farmers must be won to the revolution, that their support cannot be taken for granted. It is easy to alienate this important social layer, especially where economic scarcity makes it impossible to deliver immediate material improvements. Their isolation, backwardness, and fear of change all make the small farmers susceptible to the propaganda of the big growers and their political parties.

Small farmers everywhere are afraid of losing their land, and this is a fear reactionaries try to capitalize on.

The Sandinistas have intelligently taken a sensitive approach to the land question. One the one hand, they have refused to bend to pressures to break up the huge nationalized estates into small unproductive individual landholdings. But on the other, they have made it clear that they do not plan to expropriate the land of anyone who is actually producing.

In fact, they point out, it was the Somoza dictatorship that drove thousands of farmers off their land. Now the credit policy of the national bank in revolutionary Nicaragua is designed to help family farmers hold onto their private property in land.

In order to reassure the small farmers, the government has recently returned to their original owners some medium-sized farms that were taken over after the revolution. This is not a massive phenomenon, but in almost every province several cases were found of expropriated farms whose owners were not actually Somozaists and were willing to remain in the country and farm.

One interesting example involved a North American named Gregg Baldwin, who in 1971 invested his savings in a fifty-manzana farm in northern Nicaragua. He and his wife would periodically work for a few months in the United States to save up money to invest in their Nicaraguan farm. When the expropriation of his farm was re-evaluated this spring, the local Sandinista Defense Committee testified that Baldwin's

relationships with neighboring farmers were excellent, "especially during the difficult days of the popular insurrection."

The FSLN newspaper *Barricada* concluded its story on Baldwin: "For all these qualities, which clearly define him as an exemplary North American—just like the majority of people in his country—the revolutionary government decided to return to him the property that had been unjustly intervened."

The FSLN's sensitivity to the concerns of the campesinos did not start with the development of the small farmers' association or even with the victory of the revolution in July 1979.

The central leaders of the FSLN all spent years in the mountains as guerrillas. They lived with the campesinos, helped them work the land, were completely dependent upon them for food, communication, and protection. These Sandinistas know first hand the grinding poverty of the campesinos' lives and also their social problems, including confused and backward ideas.

The campesinos as well as the guerrillas were affected by this relationship. As the plan of action of one of the farmers' assemblies explains: "We housed the combatants on our farms when they were in hiding, and

we helped the struggle any way we could. Therefore we are not indifferent about what happens to our revolution and our homeland."

One of the first things the Sandinista government did when it came to power was undertake the enormous task of teaching the rural population to read and write, so they could participate in the political life of the country. Without the literacy crusade, it is difficult to imagine that the Association of Small and Medium Farmers could have been built.

The Sandinista farmers add a crucial dimension to the concept of national unity to defend the revolution and build a new Nicaragua. They can serve as a pole of attraction for small businessmen and others who might otherwise feel threatened by the revolution.

The Association of Small and Medium Farmers also provides the best answer to the daily complaints of Nicaraguan capitalists that the Sandinista government is pitted against the private sector.

The big majority of the private sector—in numbers, not in wealth—consists of small farmers and ranchers. These oppressed layers increasingly stand with the revolution, not against it. □

To keep up with the liberation struggles in Central America . . . You have to read *Intercontinental Press*!

Intercontinental Press is the *only* English-language weekly in the world with a full-time bureau in Nicaragua. IP regularly carries:

- On-the-scene reports from Nicaragua, El Salvador, Cuba, Grenada, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and other countries in Latin America . . .
- Speeches by revolutionary leaders like Fidel Castro, and translations of key documents such as the program of El Salvador's Revolutionary Democratic Front . . .
- Exclusive interviews with figures like Grenada's Prime Minister Maurice Bishop, Sandinista Workers Federation leader Iván García, and Peruvian revolutionist Hugo Blanco . . .

AND, every week *Intercontinental Press* does the same for the whole world. For the best coverage of developments in Iran, Ireland, South Africa, the Middle East, Western Europe, Poland, China—read *Intercontinental Press*.

Clip and mail today

Yes! I want to subscribe. Enclosed is \$35 for a full year of IP.
 \$17.50 for six months of IP. \$8.75 for a three-month introductory subscription.

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Postal Code _____

Canadian Rates: Canadian \$41 for one year; \$21 for six months.
Send for rates to other countries.

Intercontinental Press, 410 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014.

Honduras Feels Winds of Central American Upsurge

By Lars Palmgren

TEGUCIGALPA—There are six national daily newspapers in Honduras, more than in either Nicaragua or El Salvador. And yet the total population is just slightly more than 3.5 million, and half of the adult population is illiterate. But all these papers do not express any real range of different political opinions. Positions falling outside the two big capitalist parties, the National Party (PN) and the Liberal Party (PL) are limited to a few paid advertisements.

The "hard" accusations the two traditional parties hurl at each other from the pages of the newspapers do not reflect any real political differences. The only reason for their conflict is that there are supposed to be presidential elections in Honduras in November or December 1981, and the campaign spectacle is already in full swing.

Despite their mutual accusations, the capitalist parties are campaigning around a common slogan: "Honduras is different," or as *La Prensa*, the most reactionary daily paper says: "We here in Honduras are not like those people in Nicaragua and El Salvador. We hate violence, love peace, and solve our problems with free elections." The radio adds: "Nobody needs to be liberated here."

This campaign is partly designed to prevent the Honduran people from learning the truth about what is happening in neighboring countries.

There is some truth, however, to the statement that Honduras is different. It is a fact that over 80 percent of the voting-age population participated in the elections for the Constituent Assembly in April 1980. They did that despite a boycott called by the Revolutionary Patriotic Front (FPR) which was organized by the Moscow-oriented Communist Party of Honduras (PCH), the Communist Party, Marxist-Leninist (PCML, a split from the Communist Party), the Socialist Party (PASO), and the Christian Democratic Party (PDCH).

The long lines in front of the voter-registration offices suggest that the participation in this year's presidential elections will also be high.

The real difference in Honduras, however, is that, as Reinaldo, a leader of the on-going teachers strike told us, "The revolutionary leadership is still in diapers."

A Country of Poverty

The material situation for the majority of Hondurans is terrible. Three quarters of



all children under seven years of age are malnourished. Half the adult population has a daily intake of under 1,500 calories. In the last ten years consumption of corn and beans, the staples of the Honduran diet, has actually declined.

In spite of land reform programs, most of the peasants are landless and depend on seasonal agricultural labor. During long periods of the year unemployment in the countryside is as high as 75 percent.

The elections of April 1980 were the first in over ten years. Lacking revolutionary leadership, most Hondurans saw the elections as a minimal way to influence the political situation. The surprising victory for the Liberal Party represented not so much support for the Liberals as revolt against ten years of corrupt military dictatorship. During the last five or six years, high military officials have stolen about \$120 million and deposited it in Miami banks.

The U.S. government wants a civilian president with some kind of democratic credibility in Honduras. The American ambassador, Jack Binns, has been quoted as saying, "We will accept even Cantinflas [a famous Mexican comedian] as the

winner in the upcoming presidential elections."

U.S. Bolsters Military

Washington's plans call for using the Honduran military for other tasks: to smash all attempts to form a guerrilla movement in Honduras, support the Salvadoran army in its "Operation Sandwich," and last, but not least, carry out constant harassment of Nicaragua along the common frontier.

There are indications that Washington would like to make the Honduran army the gendarme of Central America. The army already has 30,000 men, most forcibly recruited, and the air force has about twenty modern war planes and more armored helicopters.

During the last year U.S. military aid reached a new high of \$3.5 million. Increasing numbers of Honduran officials are taking special courses in the United States and Panama. The Honduran air force got special credits to buy ten new Bell VH-11H ("Huey") helicopters. In the list of U.S. military material to Honduras there are items identified as "classified products"—a category only used for very sophisticated equipment.

Growing Mobilization

The fact that last year's elections drew widespread participation and that this year's probably will too, does not however mean that U.S. imperialism's plans are going to be accepted by the Honduran masses. The revolutionary struggles in Nicaragua and El Salvador have had a big influence on Honduras.

That can be seen in the big mass mobilizations since 1978, and particularly since the election of April 1980. Mobilizations are broader, more militant, and more politi-

Honduran Political Organizations

- FMLH—Frente Morazanista de Liberación de Honduras (Morazanist Liberation Front of Honduras).
- FPH—Frente Patriótico Hondureño (Honduran Patriotic Front).
- FPR—Frente Patriótico Revolucionario (Revolutionary Patriotic Front).
- PASO—Partido Socialista (Socialist Party).
- PCH—Partido Comunista de Honduras (Communist Party of Honduras).
- PCML—Partido Comunista Marxista-Leninista (Communist Party, Marxist-Leninist).
- PDCH—Partido Demócrata Cristiano de Honduras (Christian Democratic Party of Honduras).
- PL—Partido Liberal (Liberal Party).
- PN—Partido Nacional (National Party).
- URP—Unión Revolucionario del Pueblo (People's Revolutionary Union).

cal than ever before. For example, the fight for free education reached almost insurrectional proportions in some villages and towns, where the whole population went into the streets and confronted the army. In the major cities mobilizations led by the teachers union and including students and their parents have taken over roads and bridges and occupied ministries.

Militant struggles have developed in defense of trade-union leaders. At the Rosario Mining corporation the 1,500-member union carried out a victorious one-week strike to protest the firing of their president.

Peasant cooperatives in the north, which used to be forced to sell their bananas to the multinational companies for processing, carried out strikes demanding control of the processing plants. These peasant cooperatives also carried out solidarity strikes with landless peasants in their fight for land reform.

These mobilizations are the result of and at the same time the reason for the growth of new class struggle leaderships within several of the most important trade unions.

The trade-union movement in Honduras is relatively strong but is divided and has been controlled for many years by anti-communist leaders linked to the trade-union bureaucracy in the United States and the CIA-supported American Institute for Free Labor Development. Recently, however, the class struggle tendency has gained influence in several important organizations, such as the 12,000-strong union SITRATERLO, on the United Brands banana plantations; the biggest peasant organization, ANACH; and the biggest teacher federation, CORPRA-SUMA, with 18,000 members.

These leadership changes have come about as a result of long-term organizing work among the rank and file. The congresses that have elected the new leaderships have been preceded by prolonged debates with broad participation by the members.

The revolutionary struggles in Nicaragua and El Salvador have had a significant impact on the traditional left parties as well. As Mario Soso, leader of the PCH said, "It feels as if we are suddenly coming out of our adolescence." There have been no clear changes in the program of the Honduran Communist Party, however, except that party leaders now speak about the armed struggle "as something obvious."

An intensive discussion about the lessons of Nicaragua and El Salvador has already led to splits in both the PCH and the PCML. The PCH lost an important part of its working-class cadre when a group that had worked with the Sandinistas split to form the People's Revolutionary Union (URP), which describes itself as a political-military group. Another group that also had links with the Sandinistas

split from the PCML to form a political-military group called the Morazanist Liberation Front of Honduras (FMLH).

PASO is also a product of a split from the PCML and from the Christian Democratic Party. PASO was built in close contact with the Central American Revolutionary Workers Party (PRTC) of El Salvador.

In spite of these splits and divergences, the different groups seem to be more willing to carry out united actions than ever before. This has been shown by the solidarity work with El Salvador and Nicaragua, and in discussions of creating an

electoral front called the Honduran Patriotic Front (FPH).

So even if Reinaldo is right in that the revolutionary leadership in Honduras "is still in diapers," it seems that the tendency is toward rapid maturity.

The capitalists seem to understand this quite well. Why else are they imitating their Nicaraguan and Salvadoran class brothers and getting their money out of the country? Last year capital flight from Honduras amounted to \$200 million. It seems that not even the capitalists believe their campaign slogan about "the Honduran difference." □

Solidarity Actions on Anniversary of Romero Murder

Honduran Unionists Rally for El Salvador

By Lars Palmgren

TEGUCIGALPA—"Before Archbishop Romero was murdered he came to the conclusion that the violence of the oppressed is justifiable violence. The violence of the oppressed is basically a defense against the violence that the oppressors use to defend their privileges. The violence of the oppressed is a violence to end the violence of the oppressors and create justice. . . ." A Jesuit priest is speaking.

The applause that interrupts him is not for his speaking ability but for what he says. It is March 24, 1981, the first anniversary of the murder of Salvadoran Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero. We are in a trade-union local in San Pedro Sula, the most important industrial city in Honduras, in one of the many meetings today organized in solidarity with El Salvador.

The participants at the meeting are almost all trade-union leaders and activists. One of them, the leader of the brewery workers union, ends the meeting. "And everyone now understands that the target is to get good clothing that can be used . . . as uniforms in El Salvador," he says. "Some workers have won work uniforms in their collective bargaining agreements and those would be an excellent contribution.

"But more importantly," he continues, "the compañeros of the textile factory have made a special effort in sewing several hundred."

There is not much need for discussion. Everyone is an activist in the solidarity work and has already had a great deal of experience in carrying out and achieving targets.

Honduran solidarity with the revolution in El Salvador is strong and led by the workers movement. The Coordinating Committee for Support to the People of El Salvador, which organized the San Pedro Sula meeting, is composed primarily of delegations of trade unions, student organizations, and the left parties.

The Coordinating Committee's most important campaign during the last weeks has been the campaign for the release of the Salvadoran leader Facundo Guardado, who together with other Salvadoran revolutionaries was in a Honduran jail. [Guardado was among a group of ten political prisoners who were freed by the Honduran government March 30 in response to the demands of a group of Honduran revolutionaries who hijacked a Honduran airliner a few days earlier.]

The repression in Honduras, however, is not only directed against the Salvadoran fighters. The solidarity movement has also been under constant attack. The fear of the influence of the Salvadoran revolution that the Honduran regime feels was recently expressed by the jailing of six trade-union leaders in San Pedro Sula for painting Salvadoran slogans on walls. They were charged with, among other things, "treason against the fatherland."

A two-week hunger strike and broad public demonstrations were necessary before the unionists were freed. A scandal was created when police attempted to bribe other prisoners in the jail into signing statements that the hunger strikers were eating ham and drinking orange juice at night. In solidarity, the other prisoners refused to lie.

It is not true, as someone said, that "the Salvadoran revolution will be decided in Honduras." But it is true that Honduras plays an important role in the development of the Salvadoran revolution. It is therefore important that the international solidarity movement with El Salvador be prepared to defend Honduran workers who are expressing support for their Salvadoran brothers and sisters. □

You won't miss a single issue if you subscribe.

War and the New Stage of the Iranian Revolution

[The following resolution was drafted in December 1980 and adopted at the January 22-24, 1981 convention of the Hezb-e Vahdat-e Kargaran (HVK—Workers Unity Party) in Iran. The translation is by the HVK].

* * *

In collusion with U.S. imperialism, Iraq has made a military attack against Iran in order to overthrow the Islamic Republic. Imperialist attacks against the Iranian revolution have thus entered a new stage. Their aim is to prevent the further expansion of the revolution in the area, sever the anti-imperialist dynamism of the Iranian revolution, regain imperialism's lost positions, and reverse the trend of world revolution to which the Iranian revolution has infused new strength.

The mass resistance movement against these military attacks is shaping up.

1. Imperialism strives to reverse in its favor the relationship of forces that the Iranian revolution altered on an international level against imperialist interests. This is the attempt of a declining power and the attacks take place from a position of weakness.

Iraqi President Saddam Hussein strives to prevent the expansion of the Iranian revolution, a revolution that has inspired the revolutionary spirit of the Iraqi toiling masses who are moving toward the overthrow of his regime. The mass mobilizations and anti-imperialist actions of the Iranian people has attracted the attention of the toiling Arab masses to the Iranian revolution—especially the mobilization of millions on Jerusalem Day (which since the revolution has taken place each year in solidarity with the Palestinian revolution and against Israel). This is reflected in the support given to Iran in the war with Iraq by the Libyan, Syrian, and Algerian governments (which are themselves under imperialist and Israeli pressures). On the other hand, reactionary Arab governments which have no base among their own masses take refuge in imperialism's arms, becoming more isolated from the people.

The hope of all counterrevolutionaries in the area is hinged on American imperialism. Imperialism has enhanced its military preparations for an attack against the revolution. From Turkey to Egypt, American military bases have been increased and American warships are heading toward the Persian Gulf. The confrontation between the revolution and imperialism has reached the critical stage of war.

Two large workers states, the USSR and China, that could and should have given immediate and broad military, economic, and

political aid in defense of the revolution against Iraqi attacks, have so far taken a "neutral" position. The Stalinist ruling bureaucracies in these countries thus cowardly endangered the position of the workers states versus imperialism.

2. Due to the war, the Iranian revolution has entered a new stage. The challenge of the Iraqi attack, contrary to the expectations of the leaders of the counterrevolution, was met by the Iranian army. The Islamic revolution was not overthrown. The people rose to defend the revolution.

City toilers and Arab masses of Khuzeestan fought the invaders alongside the Pasdaran (Revolutionary Guards) and the soldiers. They see their liberation intertwined with independence from the imperialist yoke and in unity with the entire Iranian revolution.

Youth all across the country enlisted to be sent to the front. Groups of twenty-two formed by the Baseej-e Mustazafin (Mobilization of the Oppressed) received military training sessions with the aid of community mosques.

Currently, through the initiative of the masses, centers of armed resistance are being formed across the country—within the factories, communities, villages, and schools. The army of 20 million is forming from the grass-roots of society, and the masses are exerting increasing control over activities in the factories, communities, and villages.

All across the country people are collecting the necessary goods and sending them by truck to the front. To ensure fair distribution of goods, community *shoras* (committees) are increasing their activities. Through the organization of the masses, the revolution is preparing itself for a long and cold winter.

Along with the formation of independent organizations of the masses, mass mobilizations—both political and military—are taking place. The city streets are once again the site of millions marching in defense of the revolution and against imperialism. Workers, peasants, women, oppressed nationalities, and tribal people view this war as their own war and see that the safeguarding of their gains and freedom is dependent on victory in the war.

On November 4 [the anniversary of the occupation of the U.S. embassy] students all across the country took part in a demonstration called by the Muslim Students Following the Imam's Line and showed the revolutionary spirit of the young generation in defense of the revolution. The participation of women in nationwide mobilizations and in mass organizations is outstanding. The vig-

ilance of the masses and the determination of the workers and toilers in defense of the revolution has attracted segments of the wavering middle-class and has neutralized other layers that tended to move toward counterrevolution.

The mass demonstration of armed men and women on October 25 in Isfahan and the demonstrations in Tabriz during the October religious holiday—the Feast of Ghadis—are symbols to the world of the power and determination of the masses in defense of the revolution. The great fighting spirit of the masses is in accord with the vital duty of victory in this war. For the first time since the February 1979 insurrection, the masses are once again arming themselves and the preinsurrection committees, with the new title of community *shoras*, are being reinstated for the purpose of rationing food and other necessary goods.

Once again, mass mobilizations of millions are taking place—like those that took place after the occupation of the U.S. spy nest, which inscribed the main enemy of the revolution in the consciousness of the masses. The experiences of the past stages of the revolution are thus coming together. At this stage of the revolution, the workers' *shoras* are the only mass organizations from the past that have retained within them the continuity of the revolution.

3. The war has accelerated class polarization—a polarization between those who want to carry the war against Iraq and imperialism through to the end and those who want to compromise. Workers consider this war their own and are prepared for death and sacrifices. Protection committees and centers of resistance have been formed in the factories. Workers are demanding mobilizations for military training and have declared their readiness to go to the front. Workers go to the front through a variety of channels, such as the groups of twenty-two organized by Baseej-e Mustazafin. In many factories workers have voluntarily donated one or several days' wages for aiding the war effort and the refugees from the war. The workers' *shoras* are being built and strengthened in this struggle. Thus the position of the working class in the revolution becomes strengthened.

Immediately following the outbreak of the war, the federation of Islamic *shoras* demanded that military mobilization and resistance centers be formed within the factories, villages, and communities. In addition, they demanded complete control over the capitalists, middlemen, and hoarders of vital goods and productive industrial commodities. They also demanded control over distribution and sales of productive goods

through the workers' Islamic shoras in the factories, and pointed to the need for creating consumer cooperatives all over in order to prevent any sabotage in distribution by the counterrevolution.

The Islamic Shoras of Workers declared in a statement: "The Islamic Shoras of Workers of Productive and Industrial Units must, with full force, implement their control of the factories and strongly prevent any conspiracies or disruptions by agents of the previous regime, capitalists, and counter-revolution; maximize production and with awareness nip in the bud any form of conspiracy."

The federation of Islamic shoras, by creating the Military-Ideological Mobilization staff, has also demanded resistance and preparedness centers be formed in the factories. The federation demanded that war news be broadcast in different languages by the Iranian news broadcasters, so that false propaganda by imperialist broadcasters be neutralized and news of the struggle of our oppressed reach the ears of oppressed people around the world.

In a message, the workers of the oil industry appealed to workers of the world to defend the Iranian revolution against the Iraqi military invasion. They asked Iraqi oil workers to apply the lessons of the struggle against the shah's regime by forming strike committees to protest against Saddam Hussein's regime.

The federation of Eastern Shoras, which had been declared illegal prior to the war, renewed its activity. Despite the fact that the local Komiteh had prevented them from being active, the federation has now renewed its activities with the same representatives in the mosques. In the factories it has distributed leaflets on the war and in defense of the revolution. Resistance centers are being organized through the shoras and Islamic associations within the factories and are training to be sent to the front.

The revolutionary spirit of workers and toilers in the time of war is the opposite of the idleness, cowardliness, and sabotage of the capitalists and landowners. From the start of the war between Iran and Iraq the class polarization has deepened, and the camps of antagonistic classes are more obvious.

In contrast to the toiling Arab masses who are defending the revolution, the reactionary khans, tribesmen, and feudalists of Susangerd welcomed the Iraqi attack. Capitalists and big landowners began hoarding and sabotaging production and distribution, and from the very beginning they fled from the war zones. The Friday Imam of Tehran, in his first Friday prayer address after the war, warned the capitalists who had fled from the war zones that they should not expect to return to their homes and demand their wealth after the toilers have fought and defended their homes and wealth. This statement reflects the deep sentiment of the masses toward the capitalists.

The capitalists and factory managers

have attacked the union rights of the workers, using the war as a pretext. In some factories, through the issuance of numerous directives, they have abolished the workers' yearly vacations and housing loans. Using the need for food and money for the front as an excuse, they have cancelled the noontime meal. The capitalists carry out these actions by misusing the workers' dedication. They continue their antagonisms to the workers' shoras to prevent their expansion and activities.

The workers' reaction to the economic austerity program of the capitalists and management has been one of patience and sacrifice due to the war conditions. At the same time, due to the disruptions by the capitalists and management on the one hand and the active participation of the workers in production and the mass resistance movement on the other, the balance of forces has shifted to the benefit of the working class against the capitalists.

The workers protest the fact that management and those in charge create obstacles to prevent mobilizations and military training. With the direct confrontation created by the war with imperialism, workers and toilers take these questions seriously. That is why they have shown patience concerning union rights, but show their disapproval when management refuses to allow mobilizations, creates obstacles to military training, or other questions related to the war and disruption in the economy. Therefore they have begun their own independent mobilizations. This serves to strengthen the workers' shoras in the direction of transforming them into independent executive units of the workers.

In wartime, the crises and chaos of the



Youth are volunteering for military service.

capitalist economy weigh heavily on the workers' shoulders, the standard of living of the working class declines, and the capitalists try to solve the crisis of their system by imposing an austerity program on the workers and toilers. Under these conditions, the struggle for the demands of the transitional program continues—i.e. an increase in wages according to the rate of inflation, reduction in working hours and adding new work-shifts with no reduction in pay. The workers, without being accused of disrupting production, are using their economic weight in the struggle to defend their standard of living.

4. The allies of the working class—poor peasants, oppressed nationalities, women, and youth—have also risen against the attacks of the Iraqi regime. The quick reaction of the masses shows that the revolution is alive and the toilers are ready to defend the achievements of the insurrection.

An important sector of the participants in the October 25 armed demonstration in Isfahan were the peasants from the villages around Isfahan who participated with their tools. The peasants from around the city of Mashad also demonstrated against the Iraqi aggression. Arab masses from the city and villages fought so heroically alongside their Pasdar and soldier brothers that they prevented the immediate fall of the cities of Khorramshahr, Abadan, Dezful, and Ahwaz. Although the Iraqi forces took over sections of the cities of Abadan and Khorramshahr, it was the armed and heroic resistance of the people, especially the Arab population, that played a decisive role.

Despite Saddam Hussein's false propaganda claiming to recognize the right of self-determination for the Arabs—which is Hussein's bourgeois nationalism against the revolution—the oppressed Arab nationality in Khuzestan has shown that it ignores such propaganda and sees its freedom as inseparable from its liberation from the yoke of imperialism and in unity with the entire Iranian revolution. The struggle of the Arab masses has defused the effects of such propaganda even in the Arab countries of the area, such as Syria, Libya, and Palestine.

In Kurdistan, where the government has not halted the war of fratricide, the Kurdish people have rightly supported the Islamic Republic against the offensive by the Iraqi regime. Groups of Kurdish workers have donated one day's wages to the front and in some Kurdish cities street demonstrations in defense of Iran and against Saddam Hussein's regime have taken place. Iraqi Kurds, who for years suffered under the oppression of the Iraqi government, are decisively struggling against the military invasion by Iraq and are fighting against Hussein's regime.

In Tabriz, as a result of the casualties from the bombings of the oil refinery and other industrial centers, the workers and toilers of Azerbaijan have felt the need for mobilization and resistance against imperialism and the Iraqi regime. The 30,000

people at the funeral for the martyrs of the bombardments of the Tabriz industrial and civilian centers showed their hatred toward the Iraqi regime and U.S. imperialism. This was the first time in six months that the oppressed Azerbaijani nationality stood up seriously against imperialist attacks. This is an indication that despite the efforts of the bourgeoisie, the anti-imperialist movement in Azerbaijan has not been diverted. The street mobilizations of the Azerbaijani people during the holy days of Ghadir, Tasua, and Ashura, and the march by the armed forces of both the army and the Pasdaran, were even more extensive.

Also, the people of Sistan and Baluchistan, plus 6,000 tribesmen and border dwellers in Bushehr organized demonstrations in defense of the revolution. The oppressed nationalities in solidarity with one another and the Iranian revolution are struggling for their liberation from the imperialist yoke. Therefore, the perspective of their unity for further strengthening and advancing the anti-imperialist struggle has now become more of a reality.

The solidarity of women and their declared readiness to go to the front is widely raised. Women have participated in first aid groups and in the preparation of goods and

money being sent to the front. Women have also announced their readiness to receive military training. In some factories women have actually participated both in military training and in other aid for the front. In the Isfahan demonstration on October 25, women participated armed with home utensils, such as forks and knives, and declared their readiness to go the front. War has created the conditions for women to participate more in social activities and to see the perspectives of their liberation in the victory of the anti-imperialist movement.

The youth whose term in the army was ended in 1977—those trained by the shah to fight in Dhofar—and those ready to be drafted have widely declared their readiness to go to the front. In the first few days of the call for service of those youth whose service had ended in 1977, more than 24,000 young men registered for the front. The Khuzestan youth gathered round the army barracks, especially in Ahwaz, and demanded to be armed. The youth on the barricades began making Molotov cocktails and other ammunition, and in many border areas they have played a key role in the military battles. The community Komitehs and community shoras have once again been formed with broad participation by youth. And just as during

the insurrection they are participating in guarding the communities and distributing necessary goods. The groups of twenty-two formed by the Basee-e Mustazafin with the aid of the local mosques—which are formed to provide military training—are mostly composed of and organized by the youth.

5. The limited political-military policy of the government against the Iraqi invasion does not in the least measure up to the needs of safeguarding the revolution or to the degree of dedication and sacrifice shown by the working masses.

The unprecedented determination and militancy shown by the people in defense of the Islamic Republic was not met with a positive reaction by the government and in some cases even brought about disagreement by the government. In one directive, the Ministry of State declared the local committees, which are built from the grass-roots of the revolution, illegal. The Ministry of Education and Welfare declared that classes were to be held on November 4 [the day demonstrations were called to mark the anniversary of the occupation of the U.S. "spy nest"].

The wide-spread slogan, "arm us" is not welcome by the government. Yet at the same time, Ayatollah Montazari in his Friday speech in Qum reflected the masses' anxiety by declaring, "The army commanders are not moving ahead and acting decisively." The capitalist government fears the image of the armed oppressed masses in war with imperialism.

The devious policies of the government of the Islamic Republic with regard to the national question has harmed unity on the anti-imperialist barricades. The approach of the oppressed nationalities to this war is a sign of the revolution's depth and the high consciousness of the toilers of the oppressed nationalities.

This takes place despite all the blows, constant attacks and divisive moves, especially the civil war in Kurdistan, which was imposed on the Kurds by the regime of the Islamic Republic. The national rights of the Kurdish people are still denied. And government leaders have insisted that the army and the Pasdaran remain in Kurdistan for the war on the internal front. Columns for purging activities are collecting arms and disarming the people. In a statement addressed to the peasants of Kurdistan, the army and the Pasdaran warned those who are cooperating with the political groups by providing foodstuffs that they will be severely punished.

In Kurdistan, like in other parts of Iran, the guns must be aimed at imperialism and its lackeys. The war of fratricide in Kurdistan should be ended and a military unity formed between the Kurds and the armed forces (the army and Pasdaran) so all arms would be pointed toward imperialism. It is only by arming the Kurdish people against imperialism and the Iraqi military offensive and not their disarmament—along with



"Workers, peasants, women, oppressed nationalities, and tribal people view this war as their own . . ."

granting self-determination to Kurdistan, that the real division between the forces of the revolution and counterrevolution will be clearly defined.

The government's inability to solve the problems of war and revolution have been revealed before the masses by the lack of dynamism on the part of the government in arming the people; its lack of economic planning against high prices, unemployment, and hoarding, which is accelerating due to the government's hesitation to monopolize foreign trade; the lack of any improvement in conditions in the villages or land distribution to the poor peasants by the Committees of Seven [set up to implement the government's land reform law]; the steps toward limiting the activities of political parties and newspapers on the side of the revolution; and its imposition of censorship.

The people ask, why are the Pasdaran not being armed with heavy weapons? The Pasdaran in Kurdistan ask, what are we doing in Kurdistan when the revolution is being attacked by Iraq? The unclear points around the issue of freeing the hostages were posed in the same context. Due to the lack of open diplomacy on the part of the government and its secret negotiations with foreign officials, the people are questioning the government's actions. The toilers ask, when we are the ones who bear the heavy weight of war, why is it that scarcity and poverty are divided so inequitably and are imposed only on us, while the capitalists and big landowners continue to exploit and live in comfort?

At this new stage of the revolution, the masses look less and less to the leaders and more and more take the solution of problems into their own hands, carrying out their own mobilizations and building their own organizations. For a victory in the war, the masses are more open to listening to working-class and anti-imperialist solutions. There are tremendous possibilities for a revolutionary workers party.

In this war, the people regard the government of the Islamic Republic as being in the same front with them. As long as the working class is not prepared to take on the command of the war, it defends the revolution under the military command of this government.

Political preparations for creating a workers and farmers government are on the agenda today. These preparations include maintaining the political independence of the working class, presenting a proletarian program counterposed to the debilitating and divisive policies of the capitalist government, struggling for military and political mobilization of the masses, struggling for the unification and expansion of the workers shoras, struggling for the right to self-determination of the oppressed nationalities toward strengthening the anti-imperialist barricades, struggling for land and better conditions for poor peasants, plus struggling against poverty.

6. The military offensive of Iraq and im-

perialism for the purpose of beheading the Iranian revolution and the great mass resistance against this invasion have created immense possibilities for implementing the party's program, furthering our links with the working class, and expanding our ranks from the working-class and militant youth. Our political analysis of the new stage of the revolution emanating from the war, and the program that we as revolutionary socialists put forward for a victory in this war, would be incomplete and ineffective without specifying the next step in party building.

At the present stage of the class struggle, war and revolution have intertwined and found a joint destiny. The working class participates in this war for the victory of its own revolution, for the realization of its demands, and for obtaining the leadership of the masses. The working class views this war as its own war and struggles for its victory. The political preparations of the working class for the creation of a workers and farmers government stem from this war and participation in such struggles.

The conclusion from this reality is that our party, too, should mobilize along with our class, and consciously and actively participate in the mass resistance movement and struggle toward achieving the political leadership of this life or death battle. As a result, it is imperative now, more than ever before, that the party cadres and the militants of the Young Socialist Organization participate in all mass activities and struggles—from political, economic, and military mobilization and organization at the front, to participation in the front lines of the battle. This would be a conscious decision by the party and the youth organization in light of what is possible. In this way, the most militant elements of our class will be attracted to the party and our program presented to the entire class.

Therefore, at this juncture, making and completing the turn toward the industrial centers and the working class communities, and participating in the resistance movement through the shoras and the workers organizations, is more than ever before a pressing and vital task for our party. Our comrades should be in the heart of the working class, in the factories and in the front line of their struggles. In this way our revolutionary link with the working class becomes a reality—a unison, which, based on the program of the socialist revolution, creates the conditions for building a mass party. The party's success in the future period depends on the bold implementation of this next step.

The most important points concerning the tasks of the proletariat under the conditions of the war with Iraq and for a victory against imperialism are concretely as follows:

- The unconditional material defense of the Islamic Republic against the military intervention of the imperialists and the military offensive of the Iraqi regime and the conspiracies of its internal and foreign allies. The immediate military mobilization

and combat training of all volunteers for the front through the Baseej-e Mustazafin, with the government providing whatever is needed. Building the liberation army of 20 million. Arming the workers and peasants shoras and the community shoras. Creating and expanding the workers' centers of resistance. Providing industrial centers with defensive weapons. Arming the Pasdaran with heavy military equipment. For democracy and shoras in the army and Pasdaran.

- Confiscating the wealth of the capitalists and landowners, who in the critical conditions of war sabotage the economy through hoarding, charging high prices, and cheating. The immediate punishment and confiscation of the goods of the hoarders under the urgency of war conditions. The legislation and implementation of progressive taxation. A complete monopoly of foreign trade. Production should be subordinate to the needs of war. The nationalization of banks and insurance companies under the control of the shoras of workers and employees. Production, distribution, and price control under the supervision of workers and peasants shoras and the community shoras. The rationing of necessary goods, and oil and gasoline, giving priority to the toilers, along with the control of distribution through the community shoras. Free housing and government financial aid to the refugees from the war, along with military training and arming of the refugees.

- For the further expansion and unity of the factory shoras. Against the dissolution of the shoras. For recognition of the shoras by the government. For the power of enactment by the shoras. For independence and democracy of the shoras. Increase production through adding new work-shifts and employing the unemployed. For a forty-hour workweek. Increase wages according to the rate of inflation. Against firing members of political groups; all purges should be done through the workers shoras. Abolish Article 33 of the Labor Law (that allows firings for no reason). Labor laws should be drawn up by the workers shoras.

- Increase agricultural production; implement Section C of the Land Reform Law (that calls for land of the big landlords to be divided among the peasants); land and ample resources for poor peasants.

- The right to self-determination for oppressed nationalities. Self-determination for Kurdistan. For an immediate end to the civil war imposed on the Kurdish people. For a military alliance with the oppressed nationalities against imperialism and the Iraqi military offensive.

- Equal rights for women; military training and arming of women.

- Freedom for anti-imperialist and working-class political prisoners.

- Mobilization and utilization of all resources toward victory in the war. For the expansion and unification of the shoras of workers, peasants, soldiers, and Pasdaran.

- For a workers and farmers government. □

'Bread for Nicaragua' Campaign Launched

By Fernando Torres

[The following article appeared in the April 20 issue of *Perspectiva Mundial*, a Spanish-language revolutionary socialist fortnightly published in New York. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

In the face of the Reagan administration's increasing attacks against the revolution in Nicaragua, solidarity efforts in the United States and around the world must be stepped up.

On April 1, \$15 million in U.S. aid to Nicaragua was suspended. According to the U.S. State Department, this decision was made in response to alleged arms shipments by the Sandinista government to the revolutionary forces in El Salvador.

This charge is a clumsy and hypocritical slander since the United States government and its allies are the only ones directly intervening—with weapons, advisers, and money—in El Salvador.

The decision to cut off aid is another in a large series of U.S. attacks against the Sandinista revolution. This campaign has included accusations of nonexistent violations of human rights in Nicaragua; the financing, training, and protection of counterrevolutionary terrorist groups in Honduras and Guatemala, as well as in the state of Florida; and encouragement of reactionary forces inside Nicaragua who are trying to overthrow the Sandinista government.

An eloquent example of the Reagan administration's contempt for and brutality toward the Nicaraguan people was the decision to stop shipment of 5,000 tons of U.S. wheat per month to that country. That represents nearly all of Nicaragua's wheat imports.

According to the Augusto César Sandino Foundation, which coordinates aid for Nicaragua, this measure "signifies the use of food as a political weapon" and is a "violation of our human rights by the new, warlike administration in the United States."

"The unavailability of this raw material," according to the Augusto César Sandino Foundation, "not only condemns 60,000 Nicaraguans to unemployment, but will also worsen the malnutrition of children, which was inherited from the hated Somoza dictatorship and the system it represented."

Among the repercussions of the wheat cutoff will be: a rise in the unemployment rate due to the forced closing of mills, bakeries, and the like; a decline in family income of the workers involved in wheat-

related industries; rationing and declines in normal levels of consumption; an increase in the price of flour.

In addition, the demand for substitute products will rise, which means there will have to be larger imports of corn and plantains. This in turn will have a negative impact on Nicaragua's balance of payments, which has already been damaged by the huge foreign debts left by the Somoza dictatorship.

But the Nicaraguan people are not reacting passively to Washington's move. Under the leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front they are mobilizing within Nicaragua, while simultaneously calling for international solidarity.

The Ministry of Industry has called upon the workers to be vigilant against profiteers and speculators. "No one has more authority or more interest in preventing dishonest businessmen from taking advantage of the hunger of the people than the workers themselves," said Mario Alvarado of the Ministry of Industry.

In addition, discussions have begun on how to reduce wheat consumption, and the government is exploring alternate sources of wheat.

A national assembly of workers in the baking industry took place on March 8 to "form a continental bloc calling on all bakery unions throughout the world to solidarize with our people, demanding that the U.S. government stop the repressive

measures it is using against all Nicaraguans who are fighting to do away with the oppression, exploitation, and dependency that we have lived under for more than 150 years."

In line with this, a world campaign for "Bread for Nicaragua" was announced. It calls upon the international solidarity movement to provide "one more example of brotherhood by doing whatever is necessary to obtain the wheat on time."

The foundation also reported that donations for wheat purchases can be sent to: Fundación Augusto César Sandino; Cuenta Bancaria en Dólares; No. 1-90; Banco Nacional de Desarrollo; Sucursal Bolonia; Managua, Nicaragua.

In their resistance to the Reagan administration's attacks against their Sandinista revolution, Nicaraguans distinguish between the attitude of the U.S. government and American working people.

"We know," the foundation states, "that the American people and world solidarity movement, which is for peace and justice, will not permit these international and national reactionary forces to succeed in their disgraceful plan. The measure that Mr. Reagan is carrying out exposes a policy that aims to subordinate peoples through hunger and cuts across his declarations of 'good intentions.' This shows who really does not respect human rights." □

Thousands Protest Repression in Guadeloupe

Thousands of unionists, students, and other fighters for independence on the French-ruled Caribbean island of Guadeloupe poured into the streets during the last weeks of March to protest the French government's continuing repression.

The incident that sparked the massive protests was the arrest of four anticolonialist activists on charges of belonging to a group called the Armed Liberation Group (GLA) that has claimed credit for several bombings over the last year.

Twenty-two trade unions, political groups, newspapers, and other organizations issued a statement protesting the arrests, explaining that it was the French colonialist system that was responsible for whatever violence there was and not those who resist oppression.

Using the GLA as a pretext, the French government has increased its troop strength in Guadeloupe. And with the

French troop presence has come a step-up in harassment of Black youth on the island.

On March 21, more than 5,000 Guadeloupeans marched through the capital city of Pointe-à-Pitre.

The demonstrators called for freedom for the four prisoners as well as freedom for Guadeloupe.

Along with the stepped-up repression, Guadeloupe is experiencing a deteriorating economic situation with an official unemployment rate of 40 percent.

On March 30, a twenty-four hour general strike was called by all the Guadeloupean trade unions. It was accompanied by another march, estimated at 7,000, through Pointe-à-Pitre. Banners and placards called for an end to repression, jobs for all, and independence for Guadeloupe. The unions estimated the strike was 80 percent effective. □