

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

combined
with **inprecor**

Vol. 19, No. 28

July 27, 1981

USA \$1.25 UK 40p

Mass Murder in Lebanon **Israeli Regime's Criminal Raid on Beirut**



Poland **'Pravda' Looks at Workers Movement**



Ireland **How Discrimination Works in the North**

50,000 in Spain Demonstrate Against NATO

Mass murder in Lebanon

By Janice Lynn

In an act of premeditated mass murder, Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin ordered his U.S.-supplied warplanes into action over Beirut July 17. The Israeli jets rained bombs on heavily populated neighborhoods in the Lebanese capital. At least 300 people were killed and 800 more wounded.

This outrageous action was a sharp escalation of the Zionist regime's militaristic course, which threatens to plunge the entire Middle East into a new war.

That same day, Israeli warplanes also struck at Palestinian refugee camps on the outskirts of Beirut; attacked the Mediterranean port city of Sidon; bombed portions of Lebanon's main coastal road; destroyed three bridges in southern Lebanon; and hit a Palestinian refugee camp outside Tyre.

The Israeli aggression didn't stop there. As Israeli Prime Minister Begin and Reagan's special envoy Philip Habib were meeting in Jerusalem July 19, Israeli ground troops crossed the border into Lebanon. Paratroop and sea-borne commando forces, along with Israeli aircraft, attacked in eighteen different areas in southern Lebanon. At least a dozen people were killed in the city of Sidon, and many more elsewhere.

These criminal acts followed a week of Israeli bombing raids against Palestinian towns and villages along the coast of southern Lebanon and further inland. Almost sixty people were killed in these raids; five bridges destroyed; and numerous dwellings leveled.

Shoes and childrens toys

On July 14, Israeli warplanes also shot down a Syrian plane that was trying to thwart Israeli air strikes against Palestinian targets.

In the Beirut raid, the first air strike there since 1974, Israeli bombs totally flattened one seven-story apartment building and seriously damaged other buildings near the crowded downtown area and Arab University.

The Israeli military command claimed its attacks were aimed at destroying the headquarters of Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) leader Yasir Arafat and the offices of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

But reporters touring the area confirmed that it had been apartment houses that had been bombed. One building had completely collapsed, killing most of the families who resided there. The vast majority of the dead were women and children of Palestinian and Lebanese families living in the predominantly Muslim neighborhood. Many of the hundreds wounded were children.

The worse hit street, described by *New York Times* Beirut correspondent William Farrell, "was a scene of collapsed dwellings, eerily

listing balconies and ruptured pavements littered with thousands of household effects—clothing, shoes, children's toys, broken stereo equipment—all of it coated with a thin gray layer of dust and dirt."

Begin for bombing civilians

The bombing of Beirut coincided with a declaration by Begin that Israel's bombing attacks would be carried out against Palestinian political centers in Lebanon, even if this meant bombing densely populated civilian areas.

"We shall . . . continue to attack terrorist bases and headquarters, even if they are purposefully located in the vicinity of or within civilian concentrations," Begin warned July 17, as his bombers hammered away in Beirut.

Of course, the victims of Israel's indiscriminate bombing raids, which have gone on for more than fifteen years, have consistently been Palestinian and Lebanese civilians. The Zionist regime defines any mass of Palestinians as a terrorist concentration, any Palestinian farm or factory or meeting hall as a military target.

On July 12, for example, Israeli planes bombed the town of Damur, twelve miles south of Beirut. It is an area crowded with Palestinian refugees.

A visitor to the bomb-pitted and battered town several days later noted the still smoldering ruins of a refrigerator factory that had been hit.

"Israel always says they attack military positions," one sixty-year old Palestinian farmer pointed out. "Go and see the refrigerator factory."

Bridges and roads also targeted

On July 16, Israel's chief of staff, Lieut. Gen. Rafael Eytan declared that bridges and roads, even if mainly used by Lebanese civilians, would also be prime Israeli targets.

The destruction of the Qasmiya Bridge over the Litani River, and the bombing of seven other bridges and large portions of the major highway connecting northern and southern Lebanon, was intended to strangle the Lebanese economy and prevent the people from earning a living.

There is a large volume of farm produce, at the height of the harvest, that cannot be moved. And a serious shortage of gasoline exists, as northern Lebanon is left without direct access to the major fuel supply in the south. This was compounded by an Israeli gunboat attack on the Sidon oil refinery.

"If others suffer," Eytan callously declared, "they should press the terrorists to stop their attacks on us." He was referring to Palestinian attacks in retaliation for the Israeli bombing raids. On July 15, Palestinian rockets were fired into northern Israeli towns, in which three persons were killed. This was the first

time any Israeli was killed in a Palestinian rocket attack since 1978.

The Israeli leaders, taking their cue from the Reagan administration's anti-Soviet propaganda, claim they are attempting to stop "an endless stream" of weapons they say are pouring in for the Palestinian liberation fighters from the Soviet Union and Libya.

But it is the Israeli regime that is armed to the teeth. And Washington is its prime military supplier.

In fact, the very day of the air attack on Beirut, the Reagan administration had been planning to announce it was resuming delivery of F-16 fighter bombers to Israel. Four of these warplanes, originally scheduled for shipment on June 12, were temporarily held back following the international outcry at the Israeli regime's June 7 bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor.

With the new Israeli bombing of Beirut, the U.S. State Department postponed its announcement of lifting the suspension, and postponed for four days the delivery of six other F-16 bombers, originally scheduled to be turned over to Israel on the day of the Beirut raid as part of a total order of seventy-five. When news of this latest outrage dies down, Reagan will undoubtedly resume delivery of the war planes to Israel.

'We will go on resisting'

"We will survive no matter what Begin or Reagan want," declared PLO spokesperson Mahmoud Labadi from Beirut, following the bombing raid. "We will go on resisting no matter what kind of sophisticated weapons they use."

"Maybe they can break our hearts with our dead women and children, but they will never break our determination and our will."

With the setting up of the Zionist state of Israel in 1948, the Palestinian people were driven from their homeland. Today there are some 400,000 to 500,000 Palestinians who live as destitute refugees in camps and makeshift dwellings in Lebanon. Those Palestinians who remain in Israel live as second-class citizens, discriminated against both economically and socially.

As long as this situation prevails, the Palestinian people will continue to fight against their oppression. And Israel, surrounded by people it has expelled and oppressed, will continually lash out at its victims as the Palestinians carry on their struggle for their liberation.

Thus, a perpetual state of war is built into the foundations of the Zionist state. The conflict between Israel and the Palestinians has sharpened along with the overall rise of the anti-imperialist movement in the Mideast.

The U.S. government backs this colonial regime and its oppression of the Palestinian people. And it uses the Zionist state for its own purposes—as a permanent military base against the Arab revolution.

Israeli economic crisis

But there is another force also propelling the

Zionist regime along its militaristic course. The worldwide capitalist crisis has hit Israel hard. The current inflation rate is 133 percent per year and is expected to rise above 300 percent by the end of the year. The Israeli foreign debt has reached a staggering \$21 billion.

The Israeli rulers, like the imperialist rulers throughout the world, are driven by this crisis to seek new markets, new sources of raw materials and cheap labor, and new areas of investment. They would like to repeat the experience of 1967, when their expansion through war led to a temporary economic boom.

The Israeli rulers would also like to open new markets, not just in Lebanon, but also in Syria and other areas. *New York Times* military analyst Drew Middleton noted July 20 some Israeli officials "believe there is a favorable option for eliminating Syria as the leading Arab military power."

But precisely when the Israeli rulers need to go to war to solve their economic crisis, the Israeli workers are showing greater resistance to having to sacrifice for the war budget. They are growing increasingly wary of the government's intentions.

Some 150,000-250,000 workers—including many Arab workers—poured out on May 1, 1980, to protest against inflation and cutbacks. This demonstration, called by the Israeli Labor Party, turned into a massive display of the workers' anger and dissatisfaction.

This sentiment was also reflected during the crisis provoked by Begin in May over the presence of Syrian missiles in Lebanon. Despite Begin's attempt to whip up a war fever, there were strikes by teachers, and other public workers in defiance of the government.

Denunciations of Washington

The Israeli bombing of Beirut came only four days after U.S. State Department representative Robert McFarlane had been in Jerusalem meeting with Prime Minister Begin.

As a result of his meetings, on July 13 the U.S. and Israel had issued a statement saying that "any misunderstanding" that might have arisen over Israel's raid on the Iraqi nuclear reactor had been "clarified to the satisfaction of both sides," thus paving the way for resuming delivery of the U.S. fighter-bombers.

This statement and the meetings with Begin took place when Israel had already resumed its bombing raids in southern Lebanon.

Meanwhile, Reagan's special envoy Philip Habib, who has been shuttling back and forth between Tel Aviv, Beirut, and Syria, ostensibly to seek a peaceful solution to problems in the Mideast, was also meeting with Begin.

"The Habib mission has given the Israelis the green light for this," commented a Democratic Front spokesperson as he stood before the smoldering ruins in Beirut.

Palestinian and Lebanese representatives have indicated they hold the U.S. government, as Israel's arms supplier, responsible for the bombing raids into Lebanon.

Lebanon's deputy delegate to the United Nations charged that Israel's bombing of Bei-

rut was a deliberate effort to torpedo peace moves in Lebanon and accused the Begin regime of "provoking violence and conflict."

The Syrian newspaper *Tishrin* declared, "The Arab states must confront the United States in kind, by taking measures against it and by holding it responsible as a partner in this aggression."

Al Fajr, published in the United Arab Emirates, said that Israel "has become the U.S. arm to strike and create disturbances in the area."

The Israeli bombing was also condemned in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt.

The U.S. State Department issued a statement July 17 that pointedly contained no con-

demnation of Israel. It simply noted that "violence has spread to wider areas on both sides of the border" and that "the United States deplores this intensified violence and deeply regrets the civilian casualties and the loss of innocent lives."

Washington did not even bother to comment on the loss of Palestinian lives in the previous six days of Israeli bombing raids.

"I don't understand the United States," the sixty-year-old Palestinian farmer from Damur said. "They talk about human rights but somehow they miss the Palestinians."

The bellicose course of the U.S.-backed Israeli regime threatens to lead to new wars that endanger all humanity. □

IN THIS ISSUE

Closing News Date: July 20, 1981

POLAND	772	"Pravda" looks at the workers movement —by David Frankel
IRELAND	774	Pressure from hunger strike makes regime squirm —by Will Reissner
	775	How discrimination in the North works
SPAIN	776	50,000 in anti-NATO protest
	776	Spanish Trotskyists on anti-NATO struggle
EL SALVADOR	778	Pre-election terror—by Fred Murphy
JAMAICA	779	Washington steps up pressure—by Janice Lynn
NICARAGUA	780	Church hierarchy attacks FSLN —by Matilde Zimmermann
	781	An example of "political pluralism"—by Fred Murphy
	782	"Barricada" interviews MAP leader
MOROCCO	784	Massive uprising shakes monarchy —by Will Reissner
USA	786	Rallies back socialist suit—by Janice Lynn
	787	Government hacks get a history lesson —by Tom Martin
	792	Stop threats to Indochina!—by Fred Murphy
IRAN	789	Working class and the war
STATEMENT OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL	785	Halt the repression in Morocco!

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 Janu-
ary 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.

'Pravda' looks at the workers movement

Is Solidarity's draft program procapitalist?

By David Frankel

For the past three months, Polish workers have been discussing the draft of a proposed program for Solidarity, the independent trade union.

First published in Solidarity's national newspaper on April 17, the draft program explained in some detail the union's commitment to egalitarian social ideals, to defense of democratic rights, and to the interests of the working class and its allies—especially the small farmers.

It also discussed the origins of the social, economic, and political crisis in Polish society, and made some proposals for how this crisis can be overcome. (For the full text of the draft program, see *Intercontinental Press*, June 22 and June 29, 1981, pages 665 and 692.)

Publication of Solidarity's draft program drew a sharp response in the May 15 issue of *Pravda*, the newspaper of the Soviet Communist Party. A polemic signed by "V. Nikitin, Political Commentator," sought to link Solidarity and its draft program with "the attempts of reaction in Poland and abroad, ideologically and organizationally to disarm the Polish working people before a decisive onslaught on the People's Government can be mounted."

"The main theses laid down by the Solidarity authors," the *Pravda* polemic declared, "are basically intended as a blow at the socialist gains and rights of the working people, the Polish United Workers Party, and the foundations of the policy consistently conducted by the Polish People's Government."

It accused "certain circles inside Solidarity" with seeking "the restoration of the bourgeois system." (All quotations from the *Pravda* article are from a translation by the Novosti Press Agency that appeared in the June 15-31 issue of *Reprints From the Soviet Press*.)

Who is responsible for crisis?

Nobody can deny that Solidarity is opposed to "the policy consistently conducted by the Polish People's Government." As the Solidarity draft program points out, it was that policy which led to the current crisis and which has been rejected by the Polish workers and farmers in their millions.

But it is another thing entirely when *Pravda* pretends to speak as the defenders of "the socialist gains and rights of the working people."

Before taking up this question, however, let's take a closer look at the specific charges raised by the *Pravda* article.

• The author tries to blame the economic crisis in Poland on Solidarity.

"It is well known what role the forces heading Solidarity played in the outbreak and

development of the crisis in Poland," says *Pravda*.

Summing up its view of Solidarity's role, *Pravda* says, "It takes no great skill to disrupt and ruin the economy of a country, no matter how prosperous and happy. . . ."

The article insists that "the responsibility for rationing lies entirely with the extremist forces of Solidarity itself."

Although *Pravda* talks about "the forces heading Solidarity" and "the extremist forces" in Solidarity, in reality its charges are aimed at the Polish working class as a whole.

Remember, Solidarity did not even exist in July and August 1980, when the Polish workers carried out their massive strike wave and forced the bureaucratic regime to give in to their demands for an independent trade union. But it is not the Polish workers who are to blame for the crisis.

Responsibility for "the outbreak and development of the crisis in Poland" lies squarely on the shoulders of the Stalinist regime there. The massive upsurges of 1956, 1970, and 1976 were a clear indication of the underlying crisis in Polish society.

Voices within the regime itself had been warning for years that privilege and inequality in social life, bureaucracy in the government and economy, and lack of democratic rights were leading to a new explosion. The working class was excluded from the process of making decisions about the economy, but was forced to pay the price of bureaucratic mismanagement.

By the time the working class finally moved into action once again, the economic crisis was fully developed. It was the huge foreign debt rolled up by the regime that led it to try and increase food prices in July 1980, touching off the workers upsurge.

Pravda's view of workers

Depicting the workers as too stupid to think for themselves, *Pravda* says "the worker is insistently told that he can achieve just about anything he likes by simply 'doing a little striking.'"

In Moscow, of course, the Soviet bureaucrats can say almost anything they want about Solidarity. They rely on police repression to prevent the masses of Soviet working people from reading for themselves what its draft program says. For instance, the section of the draft program on economic questions, where it says: "Solidarity—understanding that the country's economy is in really desperate straits—will not advance major wage or social demands in 1981" (*IP*, June 22, p. 669).

Censorship in the Soviet Union may em-

bolden the Soviet bureaucrats to lie through their teeth, but it cannot change the truth about the struggle in Poland.

• *Pravda* has the gall to say of the leaders of Solidarity, "Until recently, they had refrained from stating their position on major problems of social life," as if this silence was the result of some dark plot, or as if these ideas could not stand the light of day.

Perhaps the author of the *Pravda* article had forgotten that Solidarity had to fight every inch of the way to establish its own independent newspaper, where it could make its views known.

Perhaps *Pravda* was unaware of the fact that the Polish people were not allowed to state "their position on major problems of social life" until they compelled the "People's Government" to recognize their rights.

• *Pravda* is incensed that the mass organization of the Polish working class has concerned itself with the broad social and political issues facing Poland. The article complains that the Solidarity program does not pay sufficient attention to "issues which are supposedly the concern of trade unions. Instead, the Guidelines [i.e., the Solidarity draft program] focuses on the fundamental problems of the organization and functioning of the social and political system of the country. . . ."

Role of trade unions

But the trade unions in a workers state are precisely one of the vehicles for involving the working class as a whole in the process of administering the economy and the state, and of constructing a new society. *Pravda's* attitude on this question says a lot about the Soviet government's concept of the role of the working class.

The attitude expressed in *Pravda* mirrors that of trade union bureaucrats in the capitalist countries. There, too, workers are told that trade unions are solely economic organizations, that they should keep out of politics, that they should leave the running of the country to the experts who know best.

Is *Pravda* in favor of laws that limit political rights and activities of trade unions in countries like the United States? Or does it think that trade unions should have fewer rights in a workers state than under capitalism?

In fact, the Solidarity draft program explains in some detail precisely why the union felt compelled to address the broader questions of social policy. It points out:

The government has not presented a plan for leading the country out of the crisis. The plan for 1981 recently adopted by the Sejm [parliament] did not

take up the crucial problems. . . . Our union and the public in general have not even received a report on the state of the economy. This inaction is sure to cause the crisis to deepen. . . .

Faced with the indifference of the authorities, our union is compelled to launch its own initiative. We do not aim to substitute for the government. We just want to indicate, in principle, the direction that economic and social policy should take—a direction which is of fundamental importance from the point of view of the working people. . . . (IP, p. 669)

Restoration of capitalism?

- As noted earlier, *Pravda* accuses the authors of the Solidarity draft program of seeking "the restoration of the bourgeois system."

What proof does it offer for this charge? After all, as we have already seen, it is not unknown for factual inaccuracies to creep into *Pravda* now and then.

According to *Pravda*, while the authors of the Solidarity draft program

expound the concept of the dismantling of social and political foundations of socialism in Poland in a rather vague manner . . . they formulate the demands for changes in the economic sphere without beating about the bush. According to Solidarity's document, the Polish economy should function in keeping with such rules of the capitalist economy as rivalry, competition between various forms of ownership, exploitation of other people's work in the interest of private businessmen, and encouragement of the private sector in agriculture. . . .

Once again, *Pravda* depends upon its readers not having access to what the Solidarity document actually said. Far from advocating that the Polish economy function according to the rules of capitalism, the Solidarity draft program explicitly reaffirms the role of nationalized industry and state planning.

"Central planning," it says, "should no longer have the character of a commander giving out orders. . . ."

"Central plans should be strategic in character, not merely concerned with current operations, and should cover a period of several years. The goals of the central plan, which determines the overall direction of economic development, should be arrived at through the active involvement of society" (IP, p. 668).

Within the context of this central plan and the maintenance of nationalized industry, Solidarity's draft program suggested:

Production units under different forms of ownership should have the same legal and economic conditions for development under the new system. Concerns that are owned socially, cooperatively, and communally, as well as by individual families, should be treated equally in terms of market prices, supplies, and employment and tax policies. It is particularly necessary to eliminate all restrictions on the development of family farms and family-owned handicraft and service shops. (IP, p. 668)

There is nothing antisocialist about such policies. On the contrary, overcoming the alienation of Poland's 3.5 million small farmers and cementing an alliance between these farm-



'Pravda' argues that unions should stay out of politics. It opposes working class taking control of society into its own hands through its mass organizations.

ers and the working class is essential for overcoming the crisis in Poland.

Privilege and inequality

- Scraping the bottom of the barrel in its attempt to prove the evils of Solidarity, *Pravda* went so far as to cast itself as the defender of social equality in Poland, as against the independent workers movement.

Referring to the Solidarity draft program's discussion of possible effects of its proposals for surmounting the economic crisis in Poland, *Pravda* says, "as the Guidelines themselves admit, their implementation would lead to the emergence of serious social problems such as 'increased social differentiation' and unemployment. . . ."

"The prospect being opened up is the reappearance of labor exchanges and the enrichment of some at the expense of others."

Of course, what the Solidarity draft program really proposes is nothing of the kind. On the question of unemployment, the document specifically explains:

"The union recognizes that the enterprises will have the right to make changes in their employment level as they need to. But the governmental authorities will still be responsible for carrying out a full employment policy. . . . Enough money must be allocated by the government for the creation of new jobs and to cover the costs of retraining and transferring people. . . ." (IP, p. 668).

What about the question of privilege and social inequality? The draft program says:

"The costs of the program to restore equilibrium should, in the first place, fall on the shoulders of the most well-off groups, especially those who benefit from privileges flow-

ing from the exercise of authority" (IP, p. 670).

Specifically, it proposes the following measures:

- "the introduction of a universal, compulsory, and progressive tax to equalize incomes. . . ."

- "the taxation of exorbitant wealth (luxury cars, vacation homes, etc.)"

- "the restriction of unwarranted material privileges for those in the ruling apparatus (apartments, official cars, special medical services, etc.) . . ." (IP, p. 670).

Where does the Soviet regime stand on this program for attacking social inequality? *Pravda* does not say.

Who defends socialism?

Pravda claims to speak in defense of socialism and the interests of the working people. But its entire polemic, from beginning to end, is one long lie.

Lies never helped to advance any progressive cause or movement. The lie has always been the tool of reaction, of those forces seeking to confuse and disorient the masses.

It was not for nothing that Lenin named the Bolshevik newspaper that spoke for the workers and against the tsarist autocracy *Pravda*—"the truth." And in Lenin's day *Pravda* really did tell the truth.

That is no longer the case. The reason is that *Pravda* no longer speaks for the workers. Instead it defends the interests of a privileged, petty-bourgeois bureaucracy, a ruling caste that is a parasitic growth on the workers state.

That is what the Polish workers are fighting to get rid of. That is what *Pravda* represents. □

Pressure from hunger strike makes Dublin regime squirm

By Will Reissner

On July 15, Martin Hurson was buried in the small farming community of Galbally in Northern Ireland. He was the sixth republican hunger striker to die in a British jail since May 9. British troops, which had attacked the funeral procession of fallen hunger striker Joe McDonnell days earlier, did not try to interfere with Hurson's burial, despite the presence of a six-person honor guard that fired a volley of shots over Hurson's grave.

Thousands attended Hurson's funeral. Black flags hung from virtually every home in his native Cappagh, a farming village. Following Hurson's burial, it was announced that thirty-one-year-old prisoner Matthew Devlin would take his place on the hunger strike, bringing the number of fasters back to eight.

The health of two other hunger strikers is rapidly deteriorating. Kieran Doherty, who began his fast on May 22, and Kevin Lynch, who started his protest the following day, are both nearing death.

Kieran Doherty was one of two republican prisoners elected to the Irish parliament on June 11. His death in a British prison would be a major embarrassment to the newly elected government in the south of Ireland.

The strong showing of the nine prisoners who ran in the southern elections, and the victory of two of them, has been followed by a groundswell of support for the hunger strikers. This has put tremendous pressure on Garret FitzGerald, the new Irish prime minister, to back the demands of the hunger strikers.

On July 18, more than 17,000 people (according to the often understated reports in the U.S. press) marched in Dublin to support the demands of the hunger strikers. Their demonstration was attacked by police, who prevented it from proceeding to the British embassy.

If Doherty dies in prison, as he is expected to within days, the special election to fill the vacancy caused by his death could lead to the fall of FitzGerald's coalition government, which has a paper-thin majority in the parliament.

FitzGerald has been trying to convince the British government that its intransigence regarding the hunger strike is threatening British interests in all of Ireland. Two ministers in his cabinet were dispatched to London on July 10 to urge Thatcher's government to meet with the prisoners directly and adopt a more flexible attitude toward their demands.

John Kelly, the acting foreign minister, met with British officials for two hours. Kelly told reporters that "we tried to impress on them what we feel is really a deadly urgency. We told them of the pressure the Dublin govern-

ment must come under when it's trying to hold the line against violence and for a decent relationship with Britain while trying to settle this problem in which people can become so emotionally involved."

Kelly blamed British authorities for the failure of negotiations over the prisoners' demands that had been carried out by the Irish Commission for Justice and Peace, an organization connected to the Catholic Church. The commission had worked out a compromise to end the hunger strikes, only to see the British renege.

Relations between Britain and Ireland are "bound to suffer from any action or lack of action on the British side which exposes us to difficulties at home," Kelly warned.

On July 14, Ireland's ambassador to the United States, Sean Donlon, asked President Reagan to intervene to persuade Margaret Thatcher to open direct talks between the British authorities and the hunger strikers. Reagan refused.

Despite Thatcher's hard line, many British

officials are convinced that the hunger strike "has become a major embarrassment around the world," in the words of one government minister quoted in the July 16 *Washington Post*.

The British press is beginning to reflect this recognition. The July 15 *Financial Times*, a conservative daily, editorialized that the British government should agree to meet with the prisoners to prevent "a worsening of Anglo-Irish relations."

The liberal daily *Guardian* argued on the same day that the prisoners have made concessions by agreeing that their demands should be granted to the entire prison population and that the only "sticking point" was the British government's refusal to send in an official to explain the changes to the prisoners "lest he be seen as a negotiator. "That," the *Guardian* argued, "is too petty a principle on which to allow more lives—outside the prison as well as inside—to depend."

In the United States, the New York *Daily News*, the city's largest circulation newspaper, ran a July 18 editorial illustrating the foreign reaction that has the British Foreign Office so worried. The *News* stated that:

"There will be no end to the starvation deaths within the prison and the bombings, burnings and shootings elsewhere in Ulster until the London government gets off its iron horse and actively seeks a solution to the hunger strike, not a triumph over the strikers." □

Sixth hunger striker dies

Martin Hurson, twenty-seven, was the sixth Irish republican hunger striker to die in the H-Blocks of Maze prison near Belfast. Hurson's death came on July 13, on the forty-sixth day of his fast. He had replaced hunger striker Brendan McLaughlin on May 29. McLaughlin had withdrawn from the hunger strike due to an ulcer.

Hurson, who grew up on a small farm in County Tyrone as the youngest of nine children, was arrested by British troops in a dawn raid on his home in November 1976. He was interrogated and tortured in two barracks of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC)—Omagh and Cookstown. In both places he signed "confessions" following severe beatings by RUC constables who were later suspended for beating other prisoners. He was charged with membership in the Irish Republican Army, possession of explosives, causing an explosion, and conspiracy.

At his October 1977 trial, Hurson contested the validity of the statements he had signed, which were the only evidence pre-

sented against him. The judge, however, ruled that the Omagh statement was admissible and that the Cookstown statement need not be considered. On the basis of the "confession," Hurson was sentenced to twenty years in prison.

In September 1979 Hurson had a retrial. There the judge ruled that the Omagh statement used to convict him in the first trial was inadmissible, but went on to accept the Cookstown "confession." On that basis Hurson was again found guilty and received the same sentence. An appeal was disallowed in June 1980.

Upon his transfer to the H-Blocks, Martin Hurson refused to wear a prison uniform and went on the blanket protest, remaining on it until he began his hunger strike.

The hunger strikers are demanding the right to wear their own clothes, to associate in prison with other republican prisoners, to receive more mail and visits, to get time off their sentences for good behavior, and not to have to do prison labor.

How discrimination works in the North

Catholics denied housing, jobs, voting rights

[The following are portions of an interview with Fergus O'Hare and John McAnulty, conducted by Jim Upton in Belfast in June.

[McAnulty and O'Hare are both members of the People's Democracy (PD), the Irish Trotskyist organization, and were elected to four-year terms on the Belfast City Council in May.

[An interview with Fergus O'Hare, explaining the current stage of the struggle in Northern Ireland, and the character of the election campaign, appeared in the July 20, 1981, issue of *Intercontinental Press*.]

Q. The conflict in Northern Ireland is constantly presented in North America as one between Catholics and Protestants. Could you explain your views on this?

O'Hare. The whole thing is historical. The British have been able to impose their rule on Ireland over the centuries by establishing a pro-British garrison in the country. It happens that the British garrisons were of a different religion from the native Irish.

The struggle today is concentrated in the six counties of the North—a border drawn up arbitrarily by the British to ensure a pro-British majority within its confines.

As a result, the North has a minority population, which happens to be Catholic, that is opposed to British rule in the country. The majority population, which is Protestant, supports British rule. But the issue is not religion. The issue is British rule.

It is convenient for the British to portray the situation here as a sectarian struggle in which they intervene to keep these warring factions apart.

But that is not the situation. There are something like 15,000 British troops in the North at the moment, and easily 90 percent of them are concentrated in Catholic areas. They are not concentrated on the border lines between Catholic and Protestant areas. They are concentrated inside the Catholic areas. They are not defending the Catholics; they are shooting them.

The troops are here to beat down the resistance to British rule in Ireland, which comes largely from the Catholic areas. That is the basis of the struggle. It is an anti-imperialist struggle, not a religious war.

McAnulty. The state in the North is based on sectarian bigotry and discrimination. The resistance to that discrimination, which is the resistance of the majority of the Irish people to an undemocratic and armed division of their country, is not sectarian.

All of the anti-imperialist forces in Ireland stand for a secular state and oppose any religious discrimination.

The charge of religious and tribal warfare is

just a convenient smokescreen, one that is not really convincing, especially in Ireland where it has become clear to a lot of people over the years that Britain is not an impartial referee, but is rather the cause of the violence.

Q. In practice, how has discrimination against the Catholic population actually been carried out?

O'Hare. The northern state was set up sixty years ago with an inbuilt pro-British, Loyalist majority. Roughly one-third of the population was nationalist or anti-British.

The Catholic population tends to grow at a faster rate than the Protestant population because of Catholic attitudes to birth control. The Unionist government decided that unless the growth of the Catholic population was countered, Catholics would eventually become a majority and the Protestants would be outvoted.

They set about achieving their permanent pro-Loyalist majority by two basic methods.

One was to deny Catholics jobs. Catholics were forced into ghettos, but the factories were built in predominantly Loyalist areas and had a predominantly Loyalist workforce.

Even in areas where factories might have employed an anti-Unionist workforce, the owners of the factories, who were predominantly Loyalist, just would not hire Catholics.

If you had a "Catholic-sounding" name, you would not be hired. If they could not tell from your name, they asked your address. If, for instance, you lived in Ballymurphy, you were obviously a Catholic.

But if your address was in a mixed area, they simply asked you what school you went to. A school with a saint's name meant you were a Catholic and did not get the job.

This went on right up to the civil-rights period of the late 1960's—and still does, though not so blatantly.

Denying jobs to Catholics forced much of the Catholic population to emigrate.

The second way Unionists kept their majority was through massive gerrymandering of the electoral system. This was most blatantly seen in the elections for the local councils, which controlled things such as housing.

In the sphere of voting, the Loyalists had many tools to maintain their control. For example, there was a company vote. If you owned a company, you might get six or ten votes, rather than just one. Since the people who owned the companies and factories were Loyalists, this boosted the Loyalist vote.

Also, only householders had a vote. The local councils, which controlled the housing, would not give houses to Catholics. In many instances, there were a number of Catholic families living in one house, but only one—the

householder—had a vote. This disenfranchised a large number of Catholics and helped to reduce the anti-Loyalist vote.

Then they drew the electoral boundaries to ensure that Protestant votes were worth more than Catholic votes. Take an area like Derry, which has a large Catholic majority. They drew electoral boundaries so the whole Catholic population was in one district. That district might elect five councilors. But the Protestant section of the city, which is smaller, might be divided into three or four electoral areas, each with three, four, or five councilors.

Because of the way the voting districts were drawn up, the Loyalists maintained full control over Derry, despite the big majority Catholic population.

This explains why the civil-rights campaign in the late 1960's had such a revolutionary potential. The demands of the campaign were for one person-one job, one family-one house, and one person-one vote. These demands challenged the whole discriminatory basis of the northern state.

If those simple democratic demands had been granted, the Unionist domination of the country would have been ended. That is why the Unionists attempted to smash the civil-rights campaign. And that is why the civil-rights campaign led almost automatically into a struggle for self-determination and for a united Ireland.

McAnulty. This statelet in the North always had a very strong tradition of Loyalist paramilitary violence. The entire history of the northern state has been marked by pogroms against Catholics that drove them out of certain areas and out of certain occupations.

In the 1920's a series of pogroms drove Catholic families from whole areas in the countryside. One example is the small town of Banbridge, which went from 40 percent Catholic in 1918 to 10 percent Catholic in 1922.

Another example is the Belfast shipyards, which employed some Catholic workers up until the late 1920's. But the Catholics were driven out of the yards by armed mobs. Some Catholic workers were killed and others fled by swimming across the river Lagan which runs through Belfast. From then on, the yards were exclusively Protestant.

That sort of Unionist paramilitary involvement continues to this day. It is a criminal offense to be a member of the IRA—you can get ten years for membership alone, even if you do not do anything. But it is not illegal to be a member of the Ulster Defense Association, which has carried out murders and military actions designed to terrorize the Catholic and nationalist population. □

50,000 in anti-NATO protest

Also demand removal of U.S. bases

The campaign to keep Spain out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) took a big step forward on July 5 when 50,000 people attended an anti-NATO festival in Madrid. The festival also opposed the renewal of treaties granting the Pentagon military bases in Spain.

Spain's entry into the NATO alliance, according to the Spanish newspaper *Diario 16*, would involve the formation of a brigade of 3,000 troops to be sent to West Germany, the inclusion of 300 Spanish officers in the NATO military command in Brussels, and the increased use of U.S. bases in Spain for NATO operations.

In January there was a march of 20,000 people to the U.S. airbase at Torrejón, outside Madrid, to demand the removal of all bases.

The anti-NATO forces are also on a campaign to collect 500,000 signatures to force the government to hold a referendum on the question of Spain's entry into NATO.

These protests and the planned referendum campaign are especially important given the half-hearted character of the opposition to NATO being put up in parliament by the two main workers parties—the Spanish Socialist Workers Party (PSOE) and the Spanish Communist Party (PCE).

The PSOE continually vacillates between its support for U.S. military bases in Spain and opposition to Spain's entry into NATO (although not to the alliance itself). It proposes putting off the decision on joining NATO until 1983, although the government plans to finalize the entry by the end of the year.

The Communist Party's opposition to NATO and the U.S. bases is somewhat clearer than it had been until a few months ago. But it too favors postponing the decision on NATO membership until 1983 and separating the question of NATO from the bases.

Neither of these parties took part in organizing the July 5 demonstration. The festival was organized by local anti-NATO groups from towns in the Madrid area, women's organizations, ecology groups, and organizations to the left of the CP, including the Revolutionary Communist League (LCR), the Spanish section of the Fourth International.

The Madrid demonstration is part of the strong opposition to NATO plans throughout Western Europe. That opposition has centered its fire on the 1979 NATO decision to deploy 572 nuclear-armed missiles, aimed at the Soviet Union, in Western Europe.

On June 20, for example, more than 100,000 people marched in Hamburg, West Germany, to protest the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons in that country. Although Chan-

cellor Helmut Schmidt is a strong supporter of the NATO missile deployment plan, his policies have been repudiated by important sectors of his own Social Democratic Party and especially by its youth organization, the Young Socialists.

At their June 26-28 national convention, the Young Socialists unanimously called for West German rejection of the new missiles, which are scheduled for deployment in 1983. Willi Piecyk, chairman of the youth organization, called on delegates to make next October's Bonn rally against the missiles the largest in West German history.

No to NATO! Bases Out!

Spanish Trotskyists on anti-NATO struggle

[The following editorial appeared in the July 8-14 issue of *Combate*, the weekly newspaper of the Revolutionary Communist League (LCR), the section of the Fourth International in Spain. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

The attendance of more than 50,000 people at the Anti-NATO Day meeting/festival in Madrid has unquestionably been the biggest mass demonstration to date against the government's intentions to join the Atlantic Pact.

This meeting had enormous significance. It shows that the revolutionary left, which has been behind this initiative from the start, is reaching tens of thousands of people who see the need to mobilize and cannot understand why the parliamentary left remains so passive on this question, even though it claims, at least verbally, that it is ready to challenge the UCD's intentions [the Democratic Center Union is the governing party in Spain].

The meeting was the result of the patient and united work of the forces in the Anti-NATO Commission, which already had an initial successful action with the March on [the U.S. air base at] Torrejón last January 25.

But now there has been a much greater leap forward than even the most optimistic among us would have projected. Despite the climate of fear that has existed since the February 23 attempted coup, it has been shown that broad sectors of the population still have a firm desire to break through the paralysis and mobilize against NATO and the bases, and are conscious that this is also a form of struggle

An attempt by Social Democratic leader Peter Glotz to defend the missile deployment decision was met by a chorus of booing and cat-calls.

In Britain, where Prime Minister Thatcher is a supporter of the missiles, the opposition Labour Party has promised to return the missiles to the U.S. if it is elected. Thatcher, who is extremely unpopular, must call a general election by 1983, the year the missiles are to be placed in Europe.

In the Netherlands, where polls show that only 8 percent of the population favor NATO's plan to place forty-eight missiles in the country, elections last May confirmed that there is no parliamentary majority for acceptance of the missiles on Dutch soil.

In Belgium, which is also to get forty-eight missiles, broad forces are gearing up for an October 25 march in Brussels against the deployment decision. On December 9, 1979, more than 50,000 people took part in a march in the Belgian capital against the weapons. □

against any coup.

The extent of participation, the enormous number of new members gained and the support won among the workers and residents of Madrid; among neighborhood organizations; ecological groups; youth, artistic, and professional associations; and many other sectors, have made the Anti-NATO Commission the main force bringing people together in the campaign, which must continue to grow in coming months.

We know that there were two notable absences from the meeting: the PSOE [Spanish Socialist Workers Party] and the PCE [Spanish Communist Party]. But this time, more than ever, it is important that we not confuse the sectarianism of their leaders with the attitude of many of their members.

Members of the PSOE and PCE felt they were represented there in the speeches made by Pablo Castellano, a PSOE member of parliament, and Laureano Cuerdo, who spoke in the name of the Provincial Executive Committee of the Workers Commissions [CCOO—the union federation led by the CP]. The unconditional support of the ranks, and their active role in the meeting, showed that they knew that unity must be forged in those areas where there is a willingness to struggle and to mobilize effectively.

Now we must look toward the future. We must be conscious of our responsibility toward these tens of thousands of people who are waiting for new actions that can forge broader unity and, above all, that can move forward toward specific objectives that prevent Spain's entry into NATO and the renewal of the agreements



July 5 rally in Madrid.

regarding the Yankee military bases.

Activities have already been announced for other areas of the country: there will be a march on Arinaga in the Canary Islands on July 12; activities in Zaragoza after the city council's announcement of its opposition to the base; in Catalonia; in Cadiz.

Signatures are also being gathered all over for a referendum, using either the wording proposed by the Anti-NATO Commissions or other texts. Collecting 500,000 signatures is not such a difficult task when the polls themselves show that 69 percent of the population favors the referendum, as *Cambio 16* pointed out a few weeks ago.

The support for this move by unions like the Workers Commissions, moreover, insures that important sectors of the working class will take part in this objective.

Meanwhile, the negotiations between the Calvo-Sotelo government and the United States are continuing in the greatest secrecy, although in principle September 21 is the deadline for renewal of the accord (unless the agreement is extended for a year to tie up the loose ends with the General Staff of the Atlantic Pact).

But whatever the final date, it is becoming increasingly clear that the government's haste to join NATO can only be fought by intensifying the campaign and bringing in new forces and sectors. If the parliamentary left extends its truce with the government to this question as well, the consequences will be even worse, precisely because the position that the majority of the right-wing parties in parliament hold on this question does not make any "commonality" possible.

For our part, as the LCR, we will spare no effort to reach agreement with the parliamentary left, now or later. But we are convinced,

as are many workers, that only activities like the one last Sunday will enable us to force them to unite.

Nor do we hide the fact that, even among the forces that are now inside the Anti-NATO Commissions, there are differing points of view—differences regarding not only the reasons we oppose NATO, but also regarding alternative international policies.

These differences are greatest with parties like the PSOE, which openly state their support for the "Western Bloc." It would, however, be an error to try to get these united-front

organizations to come out in favor of one or another position, since that would lead to a split.

Unity can be established around what was the most popular chant last Sunday: "No to NATO! Bases Out!" This slogan, and the demand for a referendum to implement it, can in the coming months be a battle cry for millions of people throughout Spain. The revolutionary left must show that it is ready to make this a reality, by taking on the responsibilities that the big parties of the left are not carrying out. □

**When you move,
it's nice to have your mail
move with you.**

New Address:

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____

Zipcode _____

Country _____

Old Address:

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____

Zipcode _____

Country _____

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

Pre-election terror

Regime desperate as FMLN holds its ground

By Fred Murphy

Failure to make headway in military drives against the armed forces of the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN) is causing desperation among El Salvador's rulers.

Disarray inside the military-Christian Democratic government has reached such a point that the economy minister recently fled to Miami after being criticized by the defense minister; death-squad terrorism has begun to strike middle-class neighborhoods as well as poor districts in the cities; and refugees from the fighting in the countryside are being herded into prisons.

Meanwhile, the regime is pressing ahead with its plan to hold "free elections" in 1982.

'Scorched-earth' attacks

Since March, the government has been launching "counteroffensives" or "clean-up operations" against FMLN strongholds across the northern tier of El Salvador. The results were summed up in the July 10 issue of the London-based *Latin America Regional Reports*:

At the end of April, the guerrillas claimed to control 10 to 15 per cent of the country, but now say that they dominate at least 30 per cent. FMLN spokesmen say that a corridor linking Metapán in the northwest to north-eastern Morazán has been established, and that during the June fighting over 1,000 members of the security forces were killed.

In [the central province of] San Vicente, for example, the FMLN forces held their positions against army attack, rather than tactically retreating in the face of the advance by government forces.

Commenting on the San Vicente fighting, Guillermo Ungo, president of the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR), said that the government forces had been reduced to "using their helicopters as ambulances rather than military equipment."

Inability to rout the FMLN's armed units has caused the military to vent its frustration on the civilian population. On June 24 the FMLN General Command issued an urgent appeal to foreign governments and to Amnesty International and the Inter-American Human Rights Commission to press the junta to "stop the indiscriminate massacre by the Salvadoran army against 5,000 inhabitants in the province of San Vicente."

According to the FMLN, government troops had begun a "scorched-earth" operation, raining hundreds of 105mm and 120mm shells into fourteen villages in the northern part of the province. "The bombardments are uninterrupted and their target is everything that lives."

A study conducted by San Salvador's Cen-

tral American University revealed July 16 that at least 300,000 Salvadorans have fled their homes or farms as a result of the civil war. About half of these were said to be dependent on charitable organizations such as the Red Cross, Green Cross, or church organizations.

One important refugee center was the plantation of La Bermuda north of the capital, where more than 2,000 persons had gathered and were being aided by the Green Cross.

On July 3, army troops forcibly evicted the refugees from La Bermuda and burned the plantation's historic buildings to the ground. Some 500 of the refugees—including 300 children—were rounded up and transported to a penitentiary in the nearby town of Suchitoto. A National Guard major told Raymond Bonner of the *New York Times* that they had been imprisoned "because they are relatives of the guerrillas."

A week earlier Defense Minister Col. José Guillermo García had told the *Times* that he considered "at least 15 percent" of the 30,000 refugees in camps in southern Honduras to be subversives. There is, García said, "a large sector that appears to be refugees and are simply terrorists, who go precisely to find refuge, and then return, commit their misdeeds, and go back."

Preparing for elections?

In the cities, the "death squads" linked to the armed forces continue their bloody work. Of the 316 victims reported in the first two weeks of July, most were men between the ages of sixteen and thirty-five. In his Sunday homily on July 12, acting Salvadoran Archbishop Arturo Rivera y Damas said that more than seventy persons had been taken from their homes, "tortured and violently killed" during the preceding week.

Another Catholic bishop—who asked not to be identified—told Raymond Bonner of the *New York Times*: "I don't understand how governments that are called Communist, such as Poland and Nicaragua, don't kill workers or priests, but this Government, which calls itself Christian, has killed so many. . . ."

"The pity is that the United States supports this government because it is friendly to the United States. It's not friendly with its own people."

The *Latin America Regional Report* quoted earlier offered this explanation for the recent step-up in death-squad killings, which now amount to at least thirty a day:

"It is widely feared that the government may be preparing for the election, in which restrictions such as the curfew and state of siege would presumably have to be lifted, and that it

is beginning a pre-emptive strike against the civilian opposition. Such a sweep, it is feared, would take the repression to unprecedented levels."

In a major policy speech July 16, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Thomas Enders reiterated Washington's backing for the junta's election ploy.

"The Government of El Salvador has announced that it will hold presidential elections in 1983," Enders said. "Prior to that a constituent assembly to be elected in 1982 will develop a new constitution."

Enders, who directed the secret U.S. bombing of Cambodia in the late 1960s, piously declared that "all parties that renounce violence should be encouraged to participate in the design of new political institutions and the process of choosing representatives for them."

Under the provisional election law recently adopted by the junta, political parties must present the names and addresses of 3,000 of their members in order to qualify for ballot status. Under the circumstances, this would mean providing the military with a ready-made hit list for its death squads.

Democratic veneer for death squads

The call for elections is intended to put a democratic veneer on the junta while it proceeds with its effort to wipe out all opposition. Armed forces chief Col. Jaime Abdul Gutiérrez spelled this out during a visit to Uruguay in late May.

The elections, he said, will be "the result of military victory against subversion." The Revolutionary Democratic Front could not participate, Gutiérrez said, because "it is not a political party but only the democratic facade of the guerrillas."

(During the same trip, Gutiérrez stopped off to pin El Salvador's highest military medal on Chilean dictator Gen. Augusto Pinochet.)

FDR leader Rubén Zamora has termed the junta's call for elections "nothing more than an excuse to avoid a real attempt at a political solution" (*El Salvador Alert*, July 1).

Zamora compared the move to the election call "made by [ex-dictator] General Romero back in 1979 when ORDEN, the paramilitary organizations, and the security forces were attacking and killing all the opposition forces. The same thing is occurring now. . . . In addition, there exists a state of siege in the country. The press and the media are completely controlled by the government. There is no possibility of our people expressing their views. It is in this climate that Duarte is calling for elections. This is clearly a farce." □

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

Why not ask a friend, family member, or co-worker to subscribe?

For rates, see inside cover.

Washington steps up pressure

Unions protest economic blackmail

By Janice Lynn

The installation of the proimperialist regime of Edward Seaga in November 1980—with the direct backing of Washington—reflected a reassertion of Washington's grip over the Caribbean island of Jamaica.

The Seaga regime has declared its intention to increase U.S. investment in Jamaica and turn over nationalized government-run enterprises to private concerns.

In April Seaga signed an agreement with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for some US\$698 million in loans. In June Jamaica was assured of some US\$375 million in loans from the World Bank.

Under IMF conditions, Seaga must now try to hold down wages, cut social services and government employment programs, and impose severe austerity measures.

These imperialist-imposed policies are directly contrary to the interests of Jamaica's working population, the mostly Black workers and farmers who make up the majority of the island's more than two million people.

Fightback begins

But the Jamaican working people have begun to fight back. Since the elections at least seventy-two strikes and work stoppages have taken place.

In May, five trade unions—representing more than half the island's 200,000 public sector employees—rejected the government's 9 percent wage offer. They are demanding a 20-25 percent increase to keep up with rising prices.

Telephone workers, doctors, and teachers were among those protesting government wage offers. On June 1, junior doctors stopped work for one day and the National Union of Democratic Teachers demonstrated outside the finance ministry demanding larger wage increases. Hospital nurses staged a two-day strike.

Not only were workers angry at the IMF-imposed wage restraints, but also at the Seaga government's refusal to negotiate. They were especially incensed at Seaga's announcement that the island's police and army were to be treated as a "special interest group" who would get higher wage increases than other state employees.

The Workers Party of Jamaica (WPJ), the largest left-wing group on the island, estimates that these increases for soldiers and police may be as high as 60 percent.

Meanwhile, unemployment has soared since Seaga's election. Official government figures put the unemployment rate at 26.8 percent, and it is expected to go up to 38 or 39 percent in the next three years.

Rents have virtually doubled since April and the price of imported food has increased by 25 percent.

Police repression has been stepped up with Seaga's creation of a "special operations" division, also known as the eradication squad. This special force, supposedly set up to collect arms from the population, is actually engaged in a campaign of terror against opponents of the Seaga regime.

Seaga recently presented his new budget to parliament for the current fiscal year. This budget contained a \$3 million reduction in jobs programs, with all major youth employment programs being cut. More layoffs are expected as Seaga's plans for deregulation and divestment are put into effect.

Seaga's opponent in the fraudulent November elections, former Prime Minister Michael Manley of the People's National Party (PNP), has gone along with Seaga's assault on the Jamaican workers and farmers.

Both Manley and PNP spokesperson Seymour Mullings declared during the budget debate that unlike Seaga's Jamaica Labour Party (JLP) when it was in opposition, the PNP would not seek confrontation with the government, but would instead cooperate with it.

"Insofar as programmes are consistent with principles and mandate," Manley said, "we will cooperate, for we wish the country to have an opportunity to breathe."

Manley's move to right

This stance coincides with recent developments within the PNP aimed at isolating the party's strong left wing and the militant PNP youth. Under increased capitalist pressure, the Manley leadership has tried to brand the left wing of the PNP as being largely responsible for the PNP's electoral defeat.

According to official figures, which do not take into account massive vote fraud by the JLP, the PNP received 43 percent of the popular vote. Its parliamentary strength was reduced from forty-seven to nine of the sixty seats in the lower house.

Leaving out the key role of U.S. imperialism's brutal destabilization campaign in bringing about the change of government in Jamaica, Manley charged that there were three main factors involved in his defeat.

One, he said, was the state of the economy and the "long and checkered experience" with the IMF. Second, was the campaign of terror and violence carried out by Seaga's JLP thugs. And third, he said, was support from Jamaican communists.

The Workers Party of Jamaica, along with the most militant youth and other anti-impe-

rialist forces, supported the PNP's election campaign against the Washington-backed candidate, Seaga.

Decrying what he called "ideological intolerance" and "permissiveness" within the PNP, Manley insisted that "the party must so act as to make it absolutely clear we are not communist; that our objectives, with respect to the organization of the Jamaican society are not Marxist-Leninist objectives. . . ."

Manley also denied any alliance between the PNP and "local communist parties . . . although both might support similar things from time to time. . . ."

As far as the electorate was concerned, however, Manley said he believed there had been "a certain blurring of the distinction between the PNP and the local communist movement."

Manley did claim that the PNP would not resort to "cheap anti-communist rhetoric" and in the course of its work in the anti-imperialist struggle and the non-aligned movement, it would continue to cooperate with communist parties and governments. This reflects the fact that it is one thing for Manley to launch an attack on the left, but it is another for him to completely defeat it. It remains to be seen how the left wing of the PNP, and especially its youth organization, fights back against this assault.

In a statement to the PNP's national executive in May, Manley laid out the conditions under which he would remain a PNP leader. These included a specific affirmation of the PNP's support to a private sector in the Jamaican economy.

Manley also said that the PNP "must be willing to deal with and even expel members who in the future break party lines or otherwise act in a manner that damages the good name of the organization."

Former PNP Deputy Prime Minister P. J. Patterson, a leading figure in the party's "moderate" faction, spelled out what this means. "Capitalists and scientific socialists," he said, were free to leave the party.

This is aimed primarily at the PNP left wing, led by the PNP General Secretary D. K. Duncan.

Working class not defeated

There is rising discontent with the Seaga regime's collusion with the IMF. Ultimately, the only way for the government to make its economic policies work is to try to crush the trade union movement.

But the Jamaican working class has not been defeated. The workers unions remain strong and have gained considerable experience in defending their class interests.

Working class activists and anti-imperialist forces are discussing how best to move forward and they are looking to other examples.

As the WPJ noted in the July 3 editorial of its newspaper *Struggle*, "For the majority, the only way forward is not to sell ourselves, but to grit our teeth, unite more and bear the pain of standing up against imperialism, like Grenada is now standing up." □

Catholics and revolution

Church hierarchy attacks FSLN

By Matilde Zimmermann

MANAGUA—"There is an effort going on to pit the church against the revolution, and behind this campaign stand special interests in the form of money bags, strongboxes, cash, banks, and checks."

Monsignor José Arías Caldera, speaking at a groundbreaking ceremony for a new church in his Managua parish, was describing a situation that has angered many religious-minded Nicaraguans: attempts to use the moral authority of the Catholic Church to attack the FSLN and the Sandinista revolution.

In recent weeks, members of the church hierarchy have become some of the most vocal opponents of the revolution, and the right-wing media are on a campaign to portray the FSLN as persecutors of religion.

This campaign began in early June with an ultimatum from the Bishops' Conference directing priests to give up their responsibilities in the government and, in one case, in the FSLN. Six weeks later, the revolutionary priests are still carrying out their governmental or party functions and a dialogue has begun between them and the bishops.

In another incident, the archbishop of Nicaragua has refused the Sandinista television network permission to broadcast Sunday mass from any church in the country, while at the same time accusing the television system itself of "suppressing" the church services.

Pre-recorded Sunday mass, presided over by Archbishop Miguel Obando y Bravo, is a tradition that goes back to before the revolution, and had been continued by the Sandinista Television System (SSTV). On July 4, representatives of SSTV met with the archbishop's office to propose expanding the program "to better reflect the living church in the celebration of the mass."

They suggested doing one Sunday each month with either Obando y Bravo or one of the other bishops, and the other three Sundays broadcasting the mass live from different parish churches in Managua or in the provinces. The decisions as to which bishops and priests should officiate would have been left up to the archbishop.

Within hours of this meeting, the archbishop's public relations director charged in a radio broadcast that SSTV had suppressed the archbishop's Sunday mass, something even the Somoza dictatorship had not done.

On July 8, the archbishop publicly announced his decision "not to authorize, for the time being, the filming of the holy mass in any church in Nicaragua." Without his permission, no Catholic services can be televised.

Obando y Bravo, the head of the Catholic Church in Nicaragua, still enjoys a certain pol-

itical authority because of his criticisms of the Somoza regime. His attacks on the FSLN have therefore created some confusion. A religious service on July 11, billed as an homage to the bishop, drew 4,000 people. The right-wing Nicaraguan Democratic Movement (MDN) mobilized its wealthy supporters from around the country. But the FSLN daily newspaper *Barricada* reported that the service also drew some "ordinary poor people, and not just older people, but youths as well."

The next day the reactionary daily *La Prensa* ran a banner headline, "The People Are on the Bishop's Side!"

La Prensa and the international wire services have attempted to portray the deepgoing divisions within the Nicaraguan church as a conflict between the church as a whole and the Sandinista revolution. To this end, *La Prensa* has run fabricated stories about religious persecution. One such incident led to a two-day suspension of *La Prensa's* publication by the Ni-

caraguan Ministry of the Interior.

On July 7 the newspaper ran a front-page editorial denouncing antireligious mob action, along with a picture of a nun in habit next to religious billboards lying on the ground. The caption under the picture suggested that "the attack on the religious billboards is related to the campaign some political elements are carrying out against displays of religious belief on the part of the Nicaraguan people."

The accompanying editorial referred to "spiraling antireligious activity" and "dark forces"—the latter a code word for Sandinistas.

In investigating the incident, the police discovered that the nun herself had given the order for workers to take down the billboards. Citing this and three other false and provocative articles in the issues of July 7 and July 8, the Ministry of the Interior on July 11 ordered the publication of *La Prensa* suspended for two days.

Michele Najlis, a young poet and former professor of literature who is currently in charge of communications media for the Ministry of the Interior, explained why she had issued the suspension order. The obligation of the media, she said, "is to put reality in the hands of the people."

"Unfortunately," she continued, "some seem to think that freedom of expression means freedom to deceive." □

Intercontinental Press . . . It's Unique!

No other magazine in the world has the kind of in-depth political reporting and news coverage that IP presents week in and week out.

On-the-scene reports from Nicaragua, El Salvador, Ireland, Iran, Grenada, Cuba, Poland . . .

Interviews with class-struggle fighters and revolutionary leaders such as Grenadian Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and Irish liberation fighter Bernadette Devlin McAliskey . . .

Translations of key documents from the world revolutionary and workers movements . . .

Analysis and features on the most important world events and the issues facing working people—from the deadly threat of the nuclear arms race, to the liberation struggles in Southern Africa, to the changing consciousness of the U.S. working class . . .

Intercontinental Press. Subscribe Today.

YES! I want to subscribe. Enclosed is \$35 for a one-year subscription; \$17.50 for six-months; \$8.75 for a three-month introductory subscription.

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Postal Zone _____

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

An example of 'political pluralism'

Discussion among parties that support revolution

By Fred Murphy

Barricada, the daily newspaper of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in Nicaragua, recently published an extensive interview with Alejandro Gutiérrez, a leader of the Nicaraguan People's Action Movement (MAP).

The interview, which was featured on the front page of the May 31 edition of the FSLN paper, confirmed the Sandinistas' recognition that the MAP is a legitimate current within the revolutionary movement in Nicaragua. *Barricada* offered the MAP an opportunity to explain its history and political evolution and to express its opinions on some central questions now facing the revolution.

The MAP is one of several prorevolutionary political groups outside the FSLN. All now enjoy broad freedom to express themselves publicly and participate in the revolution. Leaders of some of these groups hold important posts in government ministries. Others are closely collaborating with the FSLN in the trade-union movement.

The FSLN often describes this aspect of the revolution as "political pluralism."

Dramatic shift in relations

While recognizing the existence of other political currents within the framework of the revolution, the FSLN also encourages a process of discussion aimed at achieving greater unity among revolutionists in Nicaragua. The MAP has been involved in such discussions.

In the *Barricada* interview, Alejandro Gutiérrez says the MAP is "ready for fusion" with the FSLN "if the conditions for programmatic unity and for forming a big party of the socialist revolution in Nicaragua are achieved."

The interview in *Barricada* was one important indication of the dramatic change that has taken place in the relations between the MAP and the FSLN over the past year. Just thirteen months ago, five MAP members were in jail, serving sentences for illegal possession of arms and for distribution of propaganda aimed at "damaging the interests of the people."

The MAP was formed in 1971 by activists who had left the FSLN and been attracted to Maoist political positions. During the revolutionary war against the Somoza dictatorship, the MAP organized the Anti-Somoza People's Militias (MILPAS). As Gutiérrez notes in the interview, this formation was "the second armed force" in the insurrection.

Following the July 19, 1979, victory, however, the MAP and its current in the trade unions, the Workers Front (FO), took a series of sectarian positions and tried to "outflank"



ALEJANDRO GUTIÉRREZ

Barricada

the FSLN from the left.¹

Through the pages of *El Pueblo*, the daily newspaper that it influenced, the MAP sharply criticized the real or imagined errors of the FSLN and portrayed all the revolution's progressive measures as solely the result of mass pressure. It approached the FSLN-led government as though it were a bourgeois regime. At the same time, the MAP-FO fell into opportunist positions and sided with bourgeois parties that opposed the revolution.

In October 1979 the FSLN responded to the MAP-FO's provocations with accusations not only of "infantile radicalism," but also of "neo-Somozaism." Several FO activists and *El Pueblo* staff members were jailed for a month on suspicion of illegal possession of arms. The FSLN accused the MILPAS of robbing banks and attacking army patrols, but the MAP said its armed wing had been dissolved after July 19.

To counter the FSLN's charges, the MAP called for a "dialogue" with the Sandinistas. Talks were held for several weeks in late 1979. One result was that about thirty activists left

1. For more extensive information on the conflict between the FSLN and the MAP, see *Intercontinental Press*, November 12, 1979, p. 1095, and February 18, 1980, p. 135.

the MAP and joined the FSLN.

In January 1980, however, *El Pueblo* resumed its shrill criticisms. The FO helped to organize a series of strikes in nationalized workplaces.

The FSLN responded by closing down *El Pueblo* and making a series of arrests of MAP and FO leaders. After three arms caches said to belong to the MILPAS were discovered, those arrested were sentenced to jail terms for illegal arms possession.

Easing of tensions

In June 1980 the revolutionary government issued a decree of pardon for five FO leaders and *El Pueblo* staff members who were still imprisoned. Tensions began to ease between the MAP and the FSLN.

In November, the FO participated in and helped to lead the First Assembly of Workers Unity, which marked the founding of the Nicaraguan Trade-Union Coordinating Committee (CSN). The CSN brought together Nicaragua's three largest union federations, as well as the FO, the Rural Workers Association (ATC), and organizations of teachers and health workers.

Another organization that had clashed with the FSLN in a similar way to that of the MAP-FO also participated in this process of trade-union unification. The pro-Moscow Communist Party of Nicaragua (PCN), which controls the union federation known as the CAUS,² had taken sectarian positions similar to those of the MAP in the early months of the revolution. Some of its members also spent time in jail.

In late March of this year, collaboration among the FSLN, the PCN, and the MAP-FO deepened as preparations got under way for the Discussion Forum on National Problems. The forum actually was a series of debates between the parties that support the revolution and the bourgeois forces that oppose it.³

The MAP-FO and PCN participated on the revolutionary side in the forum, along with the parties that make up the Revolutionary Patriotic Front (FPR). The FPR includes the FSLN, the pro-Moscow Nicaraguan Socialist Party (PSN) and two radical petty-bourgeois groups known as the People's Social Christian Party (PPSC) and the Independent Liberal Party (PLI).

We are reprinting here the May 31 *Barricada*

2. Confederation of Trade-Union Action and Unification. For background on the PCN's history and relations with the FSLN, see *Intercontinental Press*, July 7, 1980, p. 710.

3. See *Intercontinental Press*, July 13, 1981, p. 735.

da interview with MAP leader Alejandro Gutiérrez. One other point raised in it should be clarified: the *Barricada* interviewer asks about the MAP's relations with "'Trotskyist' currents of the Fourth International," and Gutiérrez responds that "We did receive some solidarity from the Fourth International. . . ."

Gutiérrez is evidently referring to the sectarian international currents led by Pierre Lambert of France and Nahuel Moreno of Argentina. They seized on the conflicts between the MAP and the FSLN in late 1979 and early

1980 and slandered the FSLN for allegedly repressing workers and peasants struggles in order to consolidate a bourgeois regime.

Moreno's Bolshevik Faction had adopted an extremely sectarian stance toward the Nicaraguan revolution; it split from the Fourth International over this issue in November 1980.⁴ The Bolshevik Faction later joined forces with

4. For further information on Moreno's split from the Fourth International, see *Intercontinental Press*, December 24, 1979, p. 1277.

Lambert's Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International. Their new outfit, the so-called Fourth International (International Committee), persists in sectarianism toward Nicaragua and plays no role whatsoever in the international movement of solidarity with the revolution.

The Fourth International, the world Trotskyist organization, rejected the sectarian positions of Moreno, Lambert and company. It has recognized the FSLN as the leadership of the Nicaraguan revolution.

Revolutionary unity and socialism

'Barricada' interviews MAP leader Alejandro Gutiérrez

[The following interview appeared in the May 31 issue of the Managua daily *Barricada*, official organ of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN). The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Question. Until 1978, the MAP was known as a leftist organization that followed the line of the (Maoist) Chinese Communist Party. What relations did you have with the Chinese CP?

Answer. All during the MAP's ten-year existence, we have tried to achieve—to struggle for—the development of a revolutionary Marxist outlook.

Arriving at such a position is not something that can be done all at once. The MAP has been through various stages. Now we have a more complete conception, one more consistent with Marxism-Leninism in today's historical context.

Every party has to pass through stages. For us, one of those stages involved identifying with a series of positions formulated by Mao and the Chinese Communist Party. Our organization understood these to have an advanced content.

But I do not think we were ever a party that took a position of unconditional support to the Chinese CP.

As a result of our relations with the Chinese CP and our experiences in the class struggle in Nicaragua, we began taking a critical attitude toward Maoism. By 1977 this had led to disenchantment. We still maintained relations with the Chinese CP, but they were beginning to wither away.

As the situation in Nicaragua grew more intense and the anti-imperialist struggle deepened, we demanded an attitude of greater solidarity with Nicaragua.

In 1978, several of our now-martyred comrades—such as Commander Hernaldo Herrera—told representatives of the Chinese party that we were breaking off relations because of their failure to support the struggle of the Nicaraguan people.

Q. We understand that you later changed your position and identified with the line of Enver Hoxha in Albania. What is the MAP's current position in that regard?

A. We have maintained friendly relations with the Albanian Party of Labor and with a series of Marxist organizations throughout the world. But we do not in any way see ourselves as being lined up with the positions of other parties that are pro-Albanian.

We think our central international task in this period is to develop broad contacts with various forces that oppose U.S. imperialism and that can adopt a favorable attitude toward the revolutionary struggle of our people. In that framework, closer relations may develop with organizations that are more consistently Marxist and that consistently support the struggle of the Nicaraguan people.

Q. Do you have ties with any of the "Trotskyist" currents of the Fourth International? It has been said that you received solidarity from them, and that in certain disputes among the troscos the problem of their position toward Nicaragua and toward the MAP was raised.

A. We have big disagreements with Trotskyism, both at the national and international levels.

We did receive some solidarity from the Fourth International, just as other parties did.

At present we are not involved—or rather, we do not make our disagreements with Trotskyism the axis of our ideological struggle.

Q. What is the real current strength of the MAP and the FO? It is said that you are a small detachment of cadres, a current of revolutionary opinion but with no organizational strength.

A. We are not going to debate a definition that some other sector makes of us . . .

Q. This does not involve other sectors . . . it is just a question . . .

A. Well . . . we are a force that is growing, not by encroaching on other revolutionary sectors, but by struggling against the bourgeoisie and for revolutionary unity.

We have put together a solid central nucleus, a periphery that has confidence in us, and a variety of ties to the workers and the people.

Our role in the struggle against Somozaism is a factor in our growth. All proportions guarded, we were the second armed force in the anti-Somoza battle.

Q. Has there been any evolution in your positions on the Nicaraguan revolution? At one time you spoke of a "petty bourgeois power and government," and you said it was necessary to break with the bourgeoisie in order to advance the proletarian revolution, expropriate the latifundists and the Yankee monopolies.

A. In fact, we held a series of positions that led to a period of clashes with the FSLN. But our line did not call for a policy of "socialism immediately!" or the liquidation of all private property. We understood that many of the anti-monopoly, antilatifundist transformations would have as their aim improving the living conditions of the small and medium proprietors, in order to win them as allies.

As for the participation of bourgeois representatives in the government, we considered this neither necessary nor advantageous.

We have given up some of our most radical slogans of the early period, because the current conditions are not at that level.

Looking back, we think that when we formulated such a radical set of slogans during the early period of the revolution we were taking a stance that did not flow from a calm and objective evaluation of the relationship of forces between ourselves and the forces willing to support our slogans on the one hand, and the forces that were putting forward more moderate slogans.

Q. What is the MAP's current position on national unity and the danger of imperialist

aggression against Nicaragua?

A. Nicaragua is going through a historic period, a period of transition in which a struggle is taking place to determine the course the country will follow. At the same time there is a danger of imperialist aggression against Nicaragua.

This imposes on the revolutionary forces the need to carry through a series of transformations, aimed both against the grave problems of backwardness and against the threat of intervention. It is possible that some social sectors opposed to the revolution can nonetheless be forced into limited agreements around the defense of national sovereignty.

What is involved is imposing a dynamic of transformation without losing sight of the problem of economic backwardness and imperialist aggression.

We do not favor halting the march of the revolution, but we do not call for an adventurist policy either.

Q. As for the MAP's relations with the FPR and the PCN—what is the MAP prepared to do for revolutionary unity? Does the MAP demand a hegemonic role, or does it recognize that other parties are the leading axis of the revolution?

A. We are in continual contact with the Communist Party of Nicaragua, and we have held a number of bilateral meetings with the National Directorate of the FSLN.

We note the existence inside the FPR of a variety of quite heterogeneous forces, but we are open to maintaining broad relations with them, as we have been doing in preparation for the Forum.

As for the problem of revolutionary unity, rather than being a question of hegemony it depends on programmatic criteria.

We were once reproached for demanding a perfect, finished program. We do not think that has been our attitude. Nonetheless, the fundamental programmatic bases for such revolutionary unity in defense of the Nicaraguan revolution must be sought and found.

For us, the basis of unity involves organizations with socialist or quasisocialist conceptions.

Q. But do you demand a hegemonic role?

A. Once the problem of the fundamental programmatic basis is resolved, the rest is secondary. We have no vanguardist or hegemonic pretensions, and we are not going to have a dispute with the Sandinista Front over that.

Q. But haven't you denied that the FSLN plays a vanguard role?

A. When we said once that the Sandinista Front is not the vanguard in the struggle for socialism, that did not mean that we were denying its important role. We were only expressing programmatic disagreements.

What is more, we are ready for fusion if the conditions for programmatic unity and for

forming a big party of the socialist revolution in Nicaragua are achieved.

If we do not say that the Sandinista Front is the vanguard in the struggle for socialism, this does not mean that we ignore the decisive role it is playing.

Q. So what, in your judgment, is the FSLN?

A. At present, it is a party of the masses, one that regroups enormous revolutionary contingents. It plays a determining role in the current revolutionary process, and it can play the decisive role in forming the party of the working class and in the struggle for deepening the Nicaraguan revolution.

Q. Finally, we would be interested in knowing the position of the MAP in face of the provocations of the reactionaries and of the right-wing sectors.

A. We think it is necessary to isolate and restrict the activities of the counterrevolutionary forces in Nicaragua. This must be based on the masses, on guaranteeing the rights of the workers and providing advanced solutions to the country's problems.

'Comandante Cero' leaves *Vows to continue struggle against injustice*

By Arnold Weissberg

MANAGUA—Edén Pastora, one of the most popular figures of the Sandinista revolution, has left Nicaragua to join the revolutionary struggle in some other country.

Declaring that he could "no longer stand seeing priests killed while offering mass or while carrying out the obligations of a true Christian, or seeing brother peoples dying of hunger, without being able to fire my revolutionary rifle," Pastora resigned his posts in Nicaragua July 8.

Pastora, the legendary "Comandante Cero" (Commander Zero) in charge of the FSLN capture of the Nicaraguan National Palace three years ago, held the rank of Brigade Commander, and was commander-in-chief of the Sandinista People's Militias, as well as a vice-minister of defense.

Guerrilla Commander José Valdivia left with Pastora. Valdivia had been head of the national telecommunications system.

Emphasizing that his decision was a strictly personal one, Pastora wrote in a letter to Defense Minister Humberto Ortega that he was prepared to enter "new trenches, wherever the duty of internationalist combat may take me."

In a nationally broadcast news conference July 8, the FSLN Political Commission explained that, while sympathizing with Pastora's desire to fight against injustice and tyranny, it did not approve of his decision, "which is not in accord with the foreign policy of the Sandinista revolution or with the current situation facing our country."

One of the reasons we are seeking revolutionary unity is the need to provide concrete and decisive answers in various fields—to the provocations of the imperialists and the counterrevolutionary gangs, to the diversionary role of *La Prensa*, for strengthening people's power and revolutionary consciousness. These are the weapons that will be effective in striking back and stopping the reactionary sectors.

Q. What about the reactionary role of La Prensa?

A. It is necessary to form a front of the revolutionary forces against the manipulation and slanders of *La Prensa*, so as to create the conditions for expropriating that reactionary medium.

The history of Nicaragua and the blood of the thousands of martyrs who have fallen in the struggle would justify such a revolutionary measure, once the conditions are created.

Such unity must also be built around defending the expropriations of the Somozaists, defending the People's Property Sector, defending all the achievements of the revolution, and preparing the conditions for further revolutionary transformations. □

The Political Commission said it would seek to get in touch with Pastora and Valdivia and try to convince them to return.

The proimperialist, anti-Sandinista press throughout the region used the event as another way to attack the Nicaraguan revolution, churning out rumors and lies. A Panamanian paper, for example, promised its readers an exclusive interview on how Pastora had "broken with [Commander of the Revolution Tomás] Borge and the reds" and had "fled" because of the presence of Cubans and Russians in Nicaragua.

Another favorite theme was that Pastora and Valdivia had actually left Nicaragua on some secret FSLN mission of subversion, and that Pastora's letter and the FSLN disavowal were merely cover. This charge, of course, is virtually impossible to disprove—although it is the exact opposite of what both Pastora and the FSLN said.

One report even had them headed for Libya, although neither is in need of the guerrilla training the Libyans are often accused of offering.

Pastora's abrupt departure from Nicaragua seemed to cause some concern to the military regimes in Guatemala and El Salvador. "We are ready for him," declared a Salvadoran army official, and a similar statement was issued from the Guatemalan military. Their bravado suggested, however, that perhaps they were just a bit worried about "Comandante Cero" turning up in another national palace. □

Massive uprising shakes monarchy

National unity around war in Sahara shattered

By Will Reissner

In 1975, when Spain withdrew from its phosphate-rich colony in the Western Sahara, the Moroccan and Mauritanian regime rushed in troops and divided the territory among themselves. Since that time, the Western Saharan guerrilla forces, organized in the Polisario Front (People's Front for the Liberation of Saguiet el-Hamra and Rio de Oro), have fought a tenacious battle against the new occupiers.

Unable to continue the military campaign, the Mauritanian regime dropped out of the contest on August 5, 1979, when it signed a pact with the Polisario Front renouncing all claims to the Western Sahara. But as Mauritanian forces withdrew, Moroccan troops occupied that part of the Western Sahara as well. Today some 80,000 Moroccan soldiers are bogged down in a stalemated military campaign against the independence struggle of the Western Saharan people.

In the initial stages of the war, Morocco's King Hassan II was able to draw virtually all the country's organized political forces behind the war effort. Using that support, Hassan stifled expressions of discontent with his regime for half a decade.

But more than five years of government-promoted national unity around the war effort was shattered in June when several days of fierce street fighting and general strikes rocked Morocco's major cities.

The spark that lit the powder keg was the sudden government announcement on May 29 that prices of basic foodstuffs would be raised 80 to 100 percent. This measure was the result of intense pressure from the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which demanded that Morocco cut food price subsidies as a condition for any more loans.

Early this year the IMF loaned Morocco \$1.2 billion to cover its big balance of payments deficit and to restructure its soaring foreign debt.

Partial retreat no help

The announcement of price increases provoked an immediate outcry, forcing the regime to beat a partial retreat. The increases were cut in half, but this did not stop the opposition.

On June 18, the leadership of the Moroccan Workers Union (UMT), a federation that has close ties to the government, felt compelled to call a general strike in Casablanca and its industrial suburbs to protest the price increases. The strike took place without incident, shutting down the city.

Two days later, on June 20, the Democratic Workers Confederation (CDT), which is close to the Socialist Union of People's Forces

(USFP), called a two-day general strike for all the major cities. That strike shut down Casablanca, Rabat, and other centers.

As night fell on June 20, fighting broke out between the police and army and demonstrators in Casablanca. At least 200 people were killed in the confrontations. Some estimates put the total at more than 600 deaths. The violence came as army patrols began forcing shopkeepers to open their stores and blocked off poor neighborhoods to try to prevent demonstrations from spreading. Over 1,000 people were arrested.

The government also carried out a sweep of union headquarters throughout Morocco. More than eighty union leaders were arrested in thirteen cities. The offices of the Socialist newspaper *Al-Moharrir* were also occupied by the police and its editor was arrested in his home. Two other leftist papers were also closed down.

The explosions of June 20 and 21 expressed the rising discontent caused by the country's severe economic crisis and the regime's inability to end the fighting in the Western Sahara. In addition to tying down some 80,000 troops, the war effort consumes 40 percent of the national budget.

The economic crisis brought on by the impact of the war and the international capitalist recession also stems from the structural problems of the Moroccan economy—the lack of a thoroughgoing land reform, the low level of industrialization, the imperialist control over major sectors of economic life.

'Green March'

For a time Hassan was successful in maintaining relative social peace, despite the economic problems, by fostering nationalist sentiment around the occupation of the Western Sahara.

In 1975, as the Spanish colonial regime prepared to withdraw from the Western Sahara, Hassan organized a march of hundreds of thousands of Moroccan civilians to occupy the territory. This "Green March," which Hassan presented as an anticolonialist action against Spanish control over a historically Moroccan area, was supported by every political group from the far right to the Party of Progress and Socialism (PPS—the Moroccan Communist Party).

The fact that all these political forces rallied behind Hassan's takeover of the Western Sahara left the Moroccan masses without any leadership or organizations that would articulate their demands and organize struggles to halt the steady decline in living standards.

But a turn in the situation began in 1978 and

1979, with several general strikes and confrontations with the regime.

The working class has played a central role in this new situation. Phosphate workers, refinery workers, dock workers, health workers, and metalworkers have been in the vanguard of struggles for higher wages, better housing, civil liberties, and freedom for political prisoners.

If Hassan is to have any hope of restabilizing the social situation, he must resolve the war in the Western Sahara. More than five years of military campaigns have not succeeded in crushing the Polisario guerrilla fighters, who have been able to strike into southern Morocco itself on a number of occasions.

While continuing to carry out military operations against the guerrillas, Hassan has recently begun a diplomatic offensive aimed at convincing the governments that provide Polisario with its main support—Libya and Algeria—to put pressure on the Saharans to give up their struggle.

In late June, Hassan accepted a recommendation by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) that there be a cease-fire and referendum over the status of the Western Sahara. But that referendum, he contends, must take place while Moroccan troops continue to occupy the territory.

In addition, the Moroccan regime claims that only 74,000 people are eligible to participate in the referendum, while Polisario puts the population of the Western Sahara at nearly ten times that figure. Hassan's proposal would disenfranchise tens of thousands of Saharan refugees forced to flee by Moroccan attacks on the civilian population.

While Polisario has agreed in principle to a referendum, it insists that Moroccan troops and administrators withdraw from the Western Sahara before any vote takes place. The vote would also have to include Saharan refugees now living in camps in Algeria.

Regime leans on reformists

Given the economic problems facing Morocco, Hassan is resorting to the customary prescriptions of the IMF—imposition of austerity measures and sharp cuts in public expenditures. In an attempt to curtail future social explosions in response to such measures, the monarchy is seeking support from the reformist workers parties.

Hassan has, for example, promised to give the Socialist Union of People's Forces a larger role in parliament. But he warns that if the USFP withdraws from parliament in protest against the massacres, as it has threatened, he

will outlaw the party!

Both the Party of Progress and Socialism and the USFP participated in Hassan's delegation to the OAU conference while Hassan's troops were still patrolling Casablanca following the general strike.

The reformists are under intense pressure from two sides. If they do not play along with Hassan, they are threatened with illegality and

repression. But the workers have shown that they want an end to the austerity and repression.

If the political parties and unions are to retain any following among the Moroccan masses, they must respond to their sentiments. But the general strikes in June show that any action called by the reformists can result in much more than they bargained for. □

STATEMENT OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Halt the repression in Morocco!

[The following statement was adopted by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International at its June 29-30, 1981, meeting.]

* * *

Following a sharp increase in the price of foodstuffs—decided by the government in the framework of an economic policy imposed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF)—mass demonstrations broke out in Casablanca, Rabat, and other towns in Morocco. A partial reduction of the increases was immediately announced in order to avoid the spread of the struggles. This did not work.

On June 20 the Democratic Workers Confederation (CDT) launched a general strike. There was a massive mobilization of the workers. The small shopkeepers and artisans joined in the protest, as well as the plebian masses from the poorer and workers neighborhoods. Casablanca became the scene of a real explosion—the largest since independence.

The reaction of the Hassan II regime was brutal. After an initial police intervention aimed primarily at getting the shopkeepers to immediately open up again, the army itself came on the scene, firing at point-blank range on the demonstrators, systematically sealing off neighborhoods, and carrying out mass arrests.

The toll is still not clearly established, but undoubtedly several hundred people were killed, and the number of arrests both in Casablanca and in other towns was even higher. The leaders of the Socialist Union of the People's Forces (USFP) were also imprisoned. The regime in this way is renewing its tradition of ferocious repression from March 1965.

The June 20 events are the result of a social and political crisis underway since 1978. This crisis led to several general strikes in 1979 and to other strike waves in a series of important sectors in the following years.

This crisis expresses a more general tendency, which is also seen in the other North African countries. This was demonstrated in Tunisia by the January 1978 events and later struggles, and by conflicts in Algeria. Beginning in the mid-1960s, as a consequence of economic and industrial growth, the working class took

on a greater specific weight and became increasingly conscious of its power and social role. The trade union movement was considerably strengthened through revitalization of existing organizations and the formation of new organizations.

The international economic crisis is also hitting the economies of this region extremely hard. In Morocco this is expressed by a fall in exports (textiles, phosphates, etc.) and the failure of both the previous economic plan and its replacement three-year plan. The debt to imperialist institutions and countries is an increasingly massive burden.

The regime had only one option for trying to extricate itself from the situation: to impose a drastic austerity policy. Putting such a policy into operation was precisely what provoked successive strike waves, and finally the June 20 explosion.

The working class was not isolated in this battle. The student movement has gone through a resurgence after years of stagnation. The university strike of last February was the

most spectacular evidence of this. The plebian masses of the workers neighborhoods, constantly swollen by the exodus from rural areas and composed in their overwhelming majority of young people who find themselves condemned to a miserable existence without perspectives, participated massively in the Casablanca battles.

This explosive social situation has challenged the whole political operation of Hassan. He aims to present his regime as a democracy basing itself on national consensus. This project scored an undeniable success in the first period of the war in the Sahara when the "Green March" built up a "national unity" which even included far left organizations.

But as the war got bogged down, the perspective of smashing the Polisario Front appeared less and less credible. Military spending weighed increasingly heavily on the state budget (going beyond 40 percent of the total) and the mass of the people were forced to pick up the bill for the operation. Patriotic euphoria disappeared and the war became a supplementary source of social and political tensions.

This is why Hassan is now outlining a turn on this burning question. This was concretized as the Organization of African Unity (OAU) summit in Nairobi, where the Moroccan delegation proposed the referendum solution. It has been facilitated by the accommodating attitude of the other African and North African Arab states—in the first place Algeria, whose leaders fear the consequences in the region of an indefinitely prolonged conflict and are not at all enthusiastic about a major crisis of the Moroccan regime which would inevitably have a considerable echo in their country.

Right after the Casablanca massacre, and while the city was still undergoing heavy repression, the leadership of the USFP, along with the Stalinist Party of Progress and Socialism (PPS), backed this maneuver by being part



Polisario guerrillas in Western Sahara.

of the official Nairobi delegation. This is another indication of the USFP's extremely opportunist line, which always involves compromises with the regime. However, the June 20 events show that this regime does not hesitate to force the most brutal methods to force the masses to accept ruthless exploitation.

Organizations that are a part of the workers movement and want to defend the interests of the exploited masses must make a radical change of line. They must break all collaboration with Hassan and his regime. They need to develop, organize and coordinate the struggle of the workers to ensure the defense of their living standards against the austerity measures demanded by the IMF and the government; to impose respect for the most elementary democratic rights; to demand the liberation of all political prisoners without any exception; and to end the war against the Saharan people, who have a right to self-determination.

To the extent that these struggles are broadened, generalized, and have some success, they will create the conditions for the overthrow of the regime. The unity of the political and trade union organizations of the working class and the exploited masses is a necessary condition for effectively going forward along this path.

It is the duty of the international workers movement to express its concrete solidarity with the Moroccan masses and their organizations, which are subjected to repression. The trade unions of the imperialist countries in particular must participate in this solidarity campaign by demanding their governments suspend all military aid to the Hassan regime. The colonial past and the continuing neocolonial links between France and Morocco make it especially imperative for the French Socialist Party, Communist Party, and trade union organizations to build a solidarity campaign.

Immediate freedom for all the detained trade unionists and militants!

Unrestricted freedom of organization for all parties and trade unions!

For the right to strike and to demonstrate!

Not a penny, not a gun for the war in the Sahara!

Independence for the Saharan people!

International solidarity of the trade unions and workers parties!

French trade unions and workers parties must demand that the Mitterrand-Mauroy government immediately halt all military aid to the Moroccan neocolonial regime!

Copies Missing?

Keep your files of Intercontinental Press complete and up-to-date. Missing issues for the current year may be ordered by sending \$1.25 per copy plus \$.25 for postage and handling. Write for information about previous years.

Intercontinental Press
410 West Street
New York, New York 10014

United States



Héctor Marroquín speaking in San Antonio June 20.

Matthew Harvey/Militant

Rallies back socialist suit

Reflect broad unity in fight against secret police

By Janice Lynn

In recent weeks, rallies have been held in dozens of cities throughout the United States to support the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) lawsuit against government spying and harassment.

The SWP and YSA lawsuit, first filed in July 1973, demands \$40 million in damages for years of U.S. government spying and disruption; an injunction against such activity; and a ruling that there is no basis for any sort of investigation of the SWP and YSA.

The twelve-week trial ended June 25. Both sides—the socialists and the U.S. government—will be preparing written and oral briefs summarizing their arguments.

A ruling is not expected before early 1982. Meanwhile the campaign continues to explain the issues in the socialist suit and to win support from all victims of U.S. government harassment.

The rallies were sponsored by the Political Rights Defense Fund (PRDF), which has been organizing support and raising funds for the socialist lawsuit.

Witch-hunt victims, Black leaders, unionists, antiwar activists, feminists, representatives of other workers parties, and various leftist organizations all joined together on PRDF platforms. These rallies reflected the breadth of unity that is possible in the fight against the U.S. government's secret police.

Witch-hunt victims speak

One of the keynote speakers at the New York PRDF rally—attended by some 700 people—was Morton Sobell, a codefendant in the

Rosenberg witch-hunt trial. In that infamous cold war frame-up, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were convicted of being Soviet spies. They were executed in 1953.

Witch-hunt victims from the 1950s addressed rallies in other parts of the country as well. In San Francisco, screenwriter Lester Cole—one of the Hollywood Ten jailed in the 1950s for defying the witch-hunters—received a standing ovation when he urged unity against the Reaganites.

In expressing his support for the SWP suit, Cole declared, "I was a survivor and you are survivors also, as long as you never stop fighting." Cole is currently a contributor to the *People's World*, the West Coast weekly reflecting the views of the Communist Party.

Cole was joined on the platform by SWP National Secretary Jack Barnes, and a number of prominent figures from radical organizations and various social movements and unions in the northern California area.

In New York, Barnes had reminded rally participants that the "most vicious of these [witch-hunting] blows were struck against Blacks and members of the Communist Party." Not surprisingly, Black rights fighters were among the prominent speakers at PRDF rallies.

In Winston-Salem, North Carolina, Clifton Graves, Jr.—a journalist for that city's Black weekly, *The Chronicle*—was a featured speaker.

Graves was the author of an editorial in the June 13 *Chronicle* that said of the socialist suit, "For the past eight weeks, one of the most important 'political' trials in this nation's history has been taking place in New York. A trial

with perhaps more serious ramifications for the Black American community than the trials of Joan Little, Angela Davis, and the Wilmington 10 combined!!!"

Black leaders take part

In Cleveland, Ohio, Rev. F. L. Shuttlesworth, a founder of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) in Birmingham, Alabama, was a featured speaker. Shuttlesworth helped organize and lead many civil rights marches in the South during the early 1960s, along with the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Afeni Shakur, a former member of the Black Panther Party and the victim of a 1971 government frame-up on bomb conspiracy charges, talked about the importance of the SWP and YSA lawsuit at the New York rally. Black comedian and antiwar activist Dick Gregory also addressed that rally.

Representatives of the National Black Independent Political Party, the Anti-Klan Network, the Black United Front, and local Black rights activists participated in many of the rallies.

South African exile Dennis Brutus addressed the Chicago rally and gave a moving presentation on behalf of the rights of foreign-born activists. Brutus, formerly a prisoner in the dreaded Robbins Island concentration camp, is an activist in the anti-apartheid movement and a renowned poet. He is currently fighting a political deportation order.

An important part of the socialists' lawsuit is the fight against attempts by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to deport foreign-born members of the SWP and YSA.

Scottish-born coal miner Marian Bustin, Mexican-born socialist Hector Marroquín, and

Mojgan Hariri-Vijeh, a nineteen-year-old Iranian student, have won widespread support for their fight against INS victimization.

The socialists' fight against the INS was also hailed by Chicano activists. In San Antonio, Texas, Antonio Cabral, vice-president of American Federation of Government Employees Local 3220 and editor of *El Pueblo*, a radical bilingual paper, described the years of harassment by the FBI and *la migra* (the immigration police) against the Chicano movement.

Greensboro and NASSCO cases

At many of the rallies, representatives of the Communist Workers Party (CWP) spoke about two other important defense campaigns. One involves a suit against government complicity in the murders of five CWP members who were protesting against the Ku Klux Klan in Greensboro, North Carolina, in November 1979.

The other is the case of three union activists at the San Diego National Steel and Shipbuilding Company (NASSCO) shipyard who were recently convicted on trumped-up conspiracy charges on the basis of testimony provided by an FBI agent-provocateur. One of the three frame-up victims, Rodney Johnson (also a member of the CWP), was a featured speaker at the San Diego PRDF rally.

"We have to continue to build this type of unity generated in the course of our struggle at NASSCO . . .," Johnson told the PRDF rally.

In San Jose, California, the well-known proprietor of the Bread and Roses bookstore, a longtime member of the Communist Party, sent a message of solidarity to the PRDF rally.

In a number of cities, representatives of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee

spoke or sent greetings.

Representatives of the California-based Peace and Freedom Party spoke at two rallies in that state and members of the New American Movement brought greetings in several other cities.

Antiwar activists, feminists, trade unionists

In addition, leaders of the El Salvador solidarity movement, antinuclear movement, and antidraft movement were speakers at almost all the rallies. Leaders of the largest women's organization, the National Organization for Women (NOW), also participated.

Representatives of the American Civil Liberties Union, National Lawyers Guild, and other prominent civil libertarians addressed many of the rallies—as did spokespeople from committees in solidarity with Nicaragua and Guatemala and Irish independence activists.

Unionists from a variety of different unions were an important part of the PRDF events. The urgency of the socialists' legal battle was highlighted at the Chicago PRDF rally by Lou Pardo, president of the largest tool-and-die unit of the International Association of Machinists.

Pardo explained how the attacks on the SWP were "a prelude to the main course"—an all-out assault on the labor movement. Summing up the powerful spirit of solidarity that prevailed in the rallies around the country, Pardo declared, "A victory in their suit is a victory for all of us."

Amid cheers and applause, SWP leader Fred Halstead echoed this sentiment. "If we learn to stick together," Halstead said, "if we learn to disagree as brothers and sisters, while uniting against them—and we all know who 'them' is—then we can beat them too." □

Marxism and the Russian revolution

Government hacks get a history lesson

By Tom Martin

NEW YORK—It is easy to claim history is on your side. But sometimes it really is.

That much was obvious from the testimony about the Russian revolution during the recent trial of charges brought by the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) against the United States government here.

The government claims that the FBI and other police agencies had the right to spy on and harass the Trotskyists because they were "subversives" plotting to overthrow the government by force and violence. As an example it pointed out that they supported what happened in Russia in 1917.

This interested Judge Thomas Griesa. When the matter first came up, he went home and sought out the relevant article from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. As he commented at one point:

"I do feel that we have gotten into history in a way that doesn't usually happen in a court case and so, in order to make it clear that I feel all of this is germane . . . the questions about the meaning of Marxism and the meaning of the teachings of Lenin and Trotsky are very important to the case.

"And where there may be difficulties in theory about the meaning of writings and so forth, I think it has occurred to me . . . that the actions of Lenin and Trotsky, the concrete actions they took, might be revealing of a full understanding of their theories—the application of Marxism under the circumstances."

Police hack vs. scholar

So each side produced expert witnesses on the subject. And the contrast was quite extraordinary.

Appearing for the government was Prof. J. Gregory Oswald. He is not exactly a "name"

among scholars of Russian history; most have never heard of him. In twenty-three years of teaching at the University of Arizona, he has produced little or no original material, merely editing two books on Soviet foreign policy.

He has one set of credentials, though, which the government obviously thought far outweighed any strictly academic considerations: his past service in U.S. Military Intelligence. This included lectures to the troops during the Korean War on "Communism and world affairs."

The expert called by the SWP to rebut Oswald's testimony was someone rather different: Prof. Stephen Cohen, author of the best known biography of N.I. Bukharin, whose academic output took six pages to list.

Cohen testified that he was not a Marxist and has no connection with the SWP. But the demolition job he did on Oswald enthralled the whole courtroom—including the judge, if not

the defense lawyers—for most of the last day of the trial.

Police theory of history

Oswald had put forward a typical police view of history. That is, that revolutions are made by small groups of people conspiring in secret to confound the will of the majority. Rather how the FBI operates, in fact!

According to this police professor: "Lenin did not believe in a mass party. He believed in a small, tight, exact, disciplined, professional, dedicated revolutionary party."

And you should have heard the way Oswald spat out each of those adjectives!

When he was asked to comment on an extract from the Transitional Program written by Trotsky for the founding conference of the Fourth International in 1938, Oswald could hardly contain himself.

Trotsky was explaining the importance of the Marxist program, which meant that sometimes, "the party can play an important historical political role not in direct relation to its numerical strength."

Oswald explained that this really meant that Trotsky "was virtually instructing his followers to think in terms of a small party."

Cohen was asked if Oswald's statement that Lenin did not believe in a mass party was accurate. His reply summed up the whole of the Arizona professor's testimony: "The statement is hard to respond to as it stands. It is quite wrong."

Cohen explained that there were indeed certain constraints on the party when it had to operate underground. But that was only a temporary, tactical consideration.

"In fact in 1917, when the despotism was overthrown and the country became a republic and elections began to occur, the Bolshevik Party became a mass electoral party.

"It went from about 18,000 members in, say, January-February 1917, which would be a small vanguard party, to a very large party of almost 300,000 by October, running, as we have seen before, in every election in sight and doing quite well."

'A revolution involves masses'

Oswald had tried to put across the idea that the Russian revolution was some kind of Bolshevik coup against the will of the vast majority. "This was not a popular takeover," he claimed.

But as Cohen explained: "A revolution involves masses of people doing something against the status quo and the existing order and . . . that was the salient feature of 1917, that it was ordinary people, the majority of the population, industrial workers, peasants and soldiers, who had been conscripted into the army as a result of World War I. These people struck out at the foundations of Russian society and they were the actors of the Russian revolution."

And how was it that the Bolshevik Party came to lead these events? Cohen explained that they were "the only major party on the

scene that identified with this radical process."

"Every shred of evidence indicates," he said, "that this was an expression of popular sentiments."

Well, the judge was very interested—but how did it fit in with the theories of Lenin and Trotsky? In particular, what about the dictatorship of the proletariat?

To the police mind of J. Gregory Oswald, the dictatorship of the proletariat meant that Lenin "decided that the Russian proletariat *per se* was not prepared to be involved in decision-making . . . and that the proletariat had to be dictated to!"

Cohen demolished this ludicrous falsification. On the contrary, he explained, the dictatorship of the proletariat was "an important idea of democracy" first developed by Marx.

He noted that Marx had asked himself, "if democracy is the good form of government, why is it so limited? Because democracy was limited everywhere by property rights and other rights or wherever there were tyrannies. . . ."

"It was his idea that when the socialist revolution came, that circumstances would be turned on its head. It would become a democracy for the majority and, during the short interval at least until these kinds of politics were abolished altogether, a dictatorship over the former ruling class."

And how was this organized in Russia? Through the soviets. These bodies were quite a problem for J. Gregory Oswald.

Role of soviets

Oswald had made much of the supposed legality of the provisional government, which was based on "a legitimate governing body known as the Duma, or parliament."

The Duma a legitimate governing body? As Cohen pointed out, "The Duma had been elected last in 1914 by a very limited franchise. No one seriously took that as a national government."

And the provisional government wasn't elected at all; "it was appointed by the Duma," and then in fact "changed its nature monthly and sometimes weekly" without reference even to the Duma.

Cohen added: "The only elected bodies, nationwide bodies, or national elections that were going on in the country at that time were these soviets, were to the soviets."

The idea of soviets as a possible alternative expression of majority opinion was one that had intrigued Judge Griesa from the start. He didn't necessarily go along with it, but he could see that it was an argument which had substance.

So Griesa was keen to find out from Oswald where they fit into his version of things. In particular, what had been their attitude to the overthrow of the provisional government?

This really put Oswald in a fix. Well, he said, "The soviets did not disapprove of the seizure of power."

"Did they approve?" asked Judge Griesa. Oswald wriggled some more. "They were in

no position to approve or disapprove Lenin's seizure of power."

"That may be," said the judge. "Aside from that, did they do it?"

Oswald stonewalled some more. "The soviet was in no position to say yes or no." Then he tried to change the subject, mentioning the decrees on peace and land.

But Judge Griesa wasn't satisfied. "I don't get any clear picture of what happened in this," he complained. Finally Oswald had to admit that "the next day the soviet granted general approval to this idea"—though "they had no legal right to do so."

At last the judge was satisfied. "That's what I wanted to find out," he said. But as the whole trial showed, cops don't give straight answers—even professor cops.

'All power to the soviets!'

By contrast, Cohen was completely open and convincing in his explanation of the majority character of the shift to soviet government.

He described how the role of the soviets in throwing back Kornilov's attempt at a military coup in August 1917 "completed the process through which the majority popular opinion came to look to the soviets as their national government.

"That is, the slogan which had been around in 1917 since March or April, 'All power to the soviets,' which meant we don't need the provisional government, let's have a government of soviets, let's let the soviets be the new government of Russia—that slogan now became much more than a slogan. It had become for all practical purposes a kind of reality because the provisional government was now resting heavily upon the soviets."

So, Cohen explained, "at that moment, on the night of October 24-25, it is safe to say that that was looked upon by popular opinion as a transfer of power from the provisional government to the soviets."

Professor Cohen's long discussion of the role of the masses in the Russian revolution was a convincing rebuttal of Oswald's conspiracy theory—and showed why the SWP and YSA regard 1917 as a vindication of their politics.

But it also stood in sharp contrast to what the trial has revealed about the methods of government in Washington, which are the very opposite of democratic. History is a powerful witness!

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.

Working class and the war

Interview with socialist leader

[The following interview with Siamak Zahraei, a leader of the Revolutionary Workers Party (HKE) in Iran, was conducted May 30 in New York by *Intercontinental Press* staffwriter Janice Lynn.]

* * *

Question. Two years after the revolution, what, in your opinion, is the progress that has been made in solving the problems of the Iranian workers and peasants?

Answer. Since the insurrection of 1979, the essential feature of the revolution has not changed—and that is the struggle that is going on between imperialism along with its allies (the capitalists and landowners in Iran and the reactionary regimes in the region) on the one side, and the Iranian working class and its allies on the other side.

This struggle has gone through different stages. At the present time, it is dominated (especially in the minds of the Iranian workers and peasants and masses of Iranian toilers, in general) by the Iraqi invasion of parts of Khuzestan.

This is seen in Iran as a provocation by the imperialists, that the imperialists are behind this war. So, this war situation dominates Iranian life and has changed in many ways the daily life of the people.

Many large cities, like Khorramshahr and Abadan, have been totally demolished. Cities like Ahwaz have been damaged extensively, as have other smaller cities. Dezful has been bombed repeatedly.

Due to this situation, over a million refugees have come to other cities.

Workers see their own situation through the question of the war. They are also coming to the understanding that while they are sacrificing, it is their ranks who are being killed in the front lines. And they are seeing that the situation in the cities and in the factories is deteriorating.

This is due first of all to the imperialist blockade—or rather, their attempt at a blockade, as it hasn't been totally successful. But they have attempted to sabotage and destroy the dependent industries.

While the workers are sacrificing, the capitalists and the landowners are benefiting. For example, they don't have to wait in lines for necessities. And they benefit enormously from the black market.

At the beginning of the war, the workers subordinated their other demands instinctively. They correctly saw that the attack by the Iraqis was the main danger. So, they toned down their other demands for a period of time.

But as the situation progressed, they saw that while they were consciously doing this, the capitalists were doing the opposite.

They began to see that in order to win the war they could not forget about organizing for the social needs of the people. That is, the need for rationing of essential goods, housing for the refugees, organizing mobilizations for the war front, and arming and training the masses.

The workers see the possibility of a victory in the war. But, at the same time, they see that the command that exists is not willing or capable of organizing such a victory.

This whole question is bringing to the fore the crisis of leadership—the crisis of leadership among the working class and the crisis of leadership among the capitalist class. The capitalists are trying to push the masses back and consolidate their own situation.

Q. What has been the response of the workers in the factories to this unwillingness of the capitalists to organize against the war? Have they taken initiatives on their own?

A. Initiatives have been taken in the factories, neighborhoods, and villages. The people have provided material aid for the front, sent

volunteers, organized military exercises, etc. But up to now this has been dispersed—on a neighborhood-to-neighborhood and factory-to-factory basis. It has not been centralized.

Workers who go to the front see the weakness of how the war is being organized. But the workers and the workers organizations have not really come to any conclusion about this situation. Discussions continue about what is the way forward.

Workers are beginning to discuss the need to change the whole economic organization of the country. They see that the industries and factories that exist cannot continue on the basis of production that existed under the past regime, which wasn't organized with the needs of the masses in mind—and especially in a situation of war.

So these kinds of discussions are taking place. For example, discussions about the need for strengthening military education and military training, which up to now has been limited to light armaments like handguns or mortars.

Q. You mentioned before that at the beginning of the war the workers were willing to subordinate their needs to the war. But then, economic questions were raised. Can you explain this more?

A. Since the war began, prices have gone up. There have been shortages here and there, even shortages of fuel and gasoline. The workers see that the capitalists run around in these big cars and don't have to wait in lines. So, they begin to question why they must continue sacrificing.

The workers also see that if the capitalists

Release Iranian socialists!

Supporters of the Iranian revolution are urgently requested to send telegrams to Iranian Prime Minister Mohammed Ali Rajai calling for the release from prison of two anti-imperialist fighters, and an end to all executions of revolutionary youth in Iran.

Faranak Zahraie and Monavar Shir Ali—two young women workers at the Ray-O-Vac battery factory in Tehran and members of the Revolutionary Workers Party (HKE)—were arrested on July 4 and taken to Evin prison.

They have been falsely accused of starting a strike in the factory and with being members of a Maoist political group.

Hundreds of participants in a July 19 demonstration in New York in solidarity with the revolutionary struggles in Central America and the Caribbean signed a petition calling for the release of the Iranian socialists and a halt to the executions. Among the signers were Puerto Rican liberation fighter Rafael Cancel Miranda, who spent more than twenty-five years in a U.S. pri-

son because of his support of the right of the Puerto Rican people to independence.

More than a dozen public transportation workers in New York City and several railroad workers in the New York-New Jersey region have sent telegrams calling for the two socialists' release.

Activists in the Irish independence struggle have also been sending telegrams. Recalling the act of solidarity with the Irish struggle against British imperialism when Churchill Street in Tehran was renamed Bobby Sands Street, these Irish activists called for the release of the two anti-imperialist women.

Among those signing this statement was Belfast City Council member Fergus O'Hare, also a member of the National H-Block/Armagh Committee.

Messages can be sent to Prime Minister Rajai at the Majlis Building, Tehran, Iran, with copies to Kargar, Box #43/174, Post Area 14, Tehran, Iran and *Jomhuri-e-Eslami*, Saadi Jonubi Street, Tehran, Iran.

are doing OK there must be resources that could be used to meet the workers' demands for better wages, better working conditions, better organization to meet the war needs. These questions continuously come forward.

For example, around the New Year [the Iranian New Year is March 21], the capitalists went on a campaign saying that because of the war, the workers should not ask for their bonuses. The New Year is the time the workers get their yearly bonus—which is actually part of their wages. So, the workers began to oppose this.

Bus workers in a district of Tehran went on strike. And the capitalists came down very harshly on this strike because when the buses are not running, then everyone knows that the workers are dissatisfied and are on strike. If it happens in an isolated factory, it does not stand out so much; it is not so obvious. So there was a big attack on the bus drivers.

This sort of experience makes the workers begin to wonder whether this government they support is not in fact a government of the capitalists. They know that it is not the same kind of government as the shah's, but they see that the capitalists have more access to the government and to the ministries in terms of pushing their needs, than do the workers.

So these conflicts continually take place. The workers see that the proposals the capitalist leaders are putting forward are not able to meet their demands, and that they must organize themselves. They must use their own organizations in order to meet their own needs.

But at this stage, they also see that their own organizations are not adequate. So discussions are continuously going on about what they should do.

Q. Could you explain a little more the role of these workers organizations?

A. Before the insurrection, the workers organized themselves into committees in order to carry through the general strike against the shah—especially the oil workers, who were in the center of the struggle. After the insurrection, these committees were kept, but the names changed. These workers committees are now called *shoras*.

After the seizure of the embassy and the imperialist offensive against our revolution—bringing their navies to the Persian Gulf region, the military attacks, and the Iraqi border threats—the workers felt their committees should be extended. In many factories, new *shoras* were organized.

These *shoras* started joining together and held broad demonstrations in support of the students occupying the U.S. Embassy and in opposition to the imperialist offensive against the revolution.

In a number of factories the *shoras* waged struggles against the capitalists who were trying to close the factories. Some *shoras* began to open up those factories whose owners had fled the country. The *shoras* began to organize in order to get raw material for the factory, organize the work force, and keep up production.

The *shoras* were generally broadened and strengthened during this time. Of course, *shoras* are not equivalent to soviets, in the sense of dual power like that which existed in the Soviet Union in 1917. This is not the situation, although aspects of this do exist on the factory level, especially around the questions of production, management, profits, etc.

Nevertheless, these are very strong political instruments in the hands of the workers. These are bodies where the workers can take their demands, and gather together to discuss their thinking and their needs.

While the Iranian working class was strong enough—through the mass mobilizations and huge demonstrations that everyone has seen—to overthrow the shah's regime, it was not strong enough to organize nationally, to bring to power its own representatives to put into effect the kinds of programs it needed. So the power was handed over to a new bourgeois regime.

It is a very contradictory situation. The working class was able to overthrow the shah and give severe blows to imperialism, but on the factory floor, the capitalists (who have long experience and know-how in repressing the workers and their organizations) have maintained their organizations on both the craft and industrial basis. The capitalists take full advantage of the state apparatus that existed for decades, using it against the workers.

The workers are discussing how best to face this situation and organize themselves to be able to withstand these pressures and answer



Iranian soldiers. "The war situation dominates Iranian life."

Kargar

the attacks by the capitalists.

Q. Could you go into the economic situation in the country, such as the question of unemployment, housing, and inflation? Are workers also involved in struggles around these issues?

A. Workers are involved here and there. But the issue of unemployment, for example, has not been a national issue that the workers organizations have taken up. This is one of their weaknesses—not leading the unemployed or taking up the issue of housing shortages, especially for the refugees who have come to the cities.

For example, on the question of housing. The workers see that there are a lot of apartment buildings and houses in Tehran that are empty and are not being used. But the workers do not confront this question head on. The government has allocated many of the houses of those capitalists who fled the country to needy people. And in some cities, the government has begun to construct new housing. So the workers do not see this as such an acute situation that they themselves are facing.

But the whole question of organizing for housing and against unemployment boils down to whether the workers can organize for a victory in the war. If the workers can organize to tie the hands of the capitalists from sabotaging the war effort and push the Iraqis and imperialists back, then they will be in a better position to take on the economic questions that you have mentioned.

Q. What kinds of peasant struggles are taking place?

A. The peasants struggles gained momentum after the seizure of the American embassy. A movement demanding land developed. A land reform program was initiated by the government in answer to this movement.

But important parts of this land reform program were not carried out. Section three, which calls for distributing the lands of the big landowners, was stopped because of pressure by the big landowners and capitalists.

The section obviously is intended to deal with the distribution of the land best suited for agriculture. But most of the land distributed so far has been devastated land or land that has been idle for a long time. To develop such land takes a lot of capital.

The peasants have their eyes on the land of the big landowners that they themselves have worked on for years. So, this is the big demand that has come forward. It has become a generalized demand in the whole country, not only among the peasants, but among the whole population.

Resolutions that are being passed in support of this land reform program are not only coming from villages all over the country, but also from mass organizations—neighborhood committees, the Pasdaran, and workers organizations.

In different places, the peasants directly take

over these lands. The feudalists and landlords retaliate and carry out armed attacks against the peasants, and some peasants have been killed.

The peasants say it is not only their interests they are defending in needing these lands for their own livelihood, but they pose it as a need to produce for the war. The Iranian people can see that such a program is obviously in their interests too.

Q. Could you go into some of the other mass organizations that have developed out of the revolution?

A. Before the insurrection, neighborhood committees were formed in order to organize the mass demonstrations, especially from the mosques. During the insurrection, these committees organized armed units in order to guard the streets, etc.

For a while, these committees went into the background. But after the U.S. embassy occupation and imperialism's military attacks against the Iranian revolution, these committees started to rejuvenate. The question of arming became more widespread. And then there was the need to train youth in the neighborhoods to fight at the front.

Another organization that developed—as part of the armed committees that came out of the insurrection—are the Pasdaran [Revolutionary Guards]. The Pasdaran formed into a national organization. They are not the same as an army.

Even though they are organized nationally, the Pasdaran are organized on the basis of committees and have certain local autonomy in terms of the different things they get involved with here and there. This is another formation we consider as a popular organization, even though it is not open for direct participation by the broad masses. But it is very much connected to the masses because of its origins.

There is a certain degree of democracy within the Pasdaran, which does not exist in the regular army. The consciousness of the youth who participate in the Pasdaran is notable. They see themselves as revolutionaries first and their task as being that of aiding the revolution and the oppressed.

Then there is the Jihad for Reconstruction, which is like a youth corps. The Jihad started organizing in the villages to help the peasants build housing, toilet facilities, public showers, provide drinking water, electricity, and also to help the peasants in their harvest and other agricultural activities. It is on a volunteer basis.

After the war began, the Jihad became involved in the war effort—going to the front and establishing headquarters and workshops to repair machinery, trucks, tractors, tanks, etc. They also help with distribution of food and collect contributions from the cities and villages.

Q. What are some of the activities that the HKE participates in, and how do you relate to these mass organizations?

A. What the HKE thinks is essential is the role of the working class in the struggle, even though the workers are a minority in the country. Because of their economic position, the workers are the main axis of the struggle.

Our orientation has been to participate in the workers struggles, to work in the factories and relate to all the other struggles through the working class organizations. We want to be on the factory floor, help organize to go to the front, participate in the military training classes in the factories, and in the workers militias.

This is also the best way to reach other strata of the population—like the peasants. The workers have the closest ties to the villages. As a worker it is also possible to participate in the neighborhood military training and in the different neighborhood activities.

We are also able to get an idea of how the workers view the different aspects of our program. We are a small organization. We cannot be in every corner of the revolution. But, being in the factories, we can relate to the workers' experiences and the demands they are raising.

The most important thing, above all, is to participate in the workers' day-to-day activities. In doing this, we have confronted severe opposition by the capitalists. The capitalists do not like our activities, especially in the committees that are organizing military training and mobilizing workers to go to the front.

So socialists have been imprisoned, and there have been attempts to expel us from the front because we are socialists, and also from the factories. We have always organized national campaigns to protest these jailings and expulsions.

In carrying out this defense work, we have learned that what is happening to us is also happening to a lot of other workers. We come into contact with workers who are struggling to organize in the factory around the right to have a job and the right to hold an opinion without being expelled.

There are laws in Iran from the past regime that have not yet been revoked. One of these is the law that the capitalists can fire a worker without any reason. That law still stands and is still being used. Our defense campaign calls for the repeal of this law. We have also been publishing many pamphlets and books, which is one of our important achievements. For example, for the first time, the works of Leon Trotsky are being translated into Farsi and distributed widely. We have published *The Revolution Betrayed*—one of the central documents of the Trotskyist movement—as well as *The Permanent Revolution*, *The Transitional Program for Socialist Revolution*, and the first volume of *The History of the Russian Revolution*.

One question that is very popular in Iran is the question of Cuba and the Cuban revolution. We have published a number of pamphlets about Cuba, including speeches of Fidel Castro and material about different experiences of the Cuban revolution. These are among our best sellers.

Our books and pamphlets are sold in many bookstores in Tehran. □

Stop threats to Indochina!

Solidarity meeting on eve of U.N. conference

By Fred Murphy

NEW YORK—"We face a really critical situation at this moment," said Chan Bun Han, a young Kampuchean who had just returned from a visit to his native land, where his entire family had been wiped out during the tyrannical reign of Pol Pot between 1975 and 1979. "The United States is trying to rewrite the history of Indochina."

Chan Bun Han was speaking to a solidarity meeting of more than 100 persons here on July 10. The Militant Labor Forum, sponsored by the Socialist Workers Party, hosted the meeting.

Other speakers included Abe Weisburd of the Committee in Solidarity With Vietnam, Kampuchea, and Laos (CSVNKL); Hung Tran of the Association of Vietnamese Patriots in the United States; and *Intercontinental Press* contributor Fred Feldman.

Feldman also pointed to U.S. imperialism's efforts to pressure the Vietnamese government to abandon the Kampuchean people to the murderous Khmer Rouge forces led by Pol Pot and aided by Peking.

"Washington wants to punish Vietnam for helping to get rid of the Pol Pot regime in Kampuchea and for working with a government that the Kampuchean people much prefer," Feldman said. "They want to make it possible for Pol Pot's army to go back into the country and to restore a government that Washington thinks would be more amenable to the Reagan administration."

Fresh confirmation of Washington's stance was provided in the week following the July 10 solidarity meeting, when the United Nations conference on Cambodia was held in New York. The conference—boycotted by Vietnam, the Soviet Union, and twenty-three other U.N. member nations—adopted a resolution calling for "free elections" in Kampuchea, withdrawal of Vietnamese troops, and the establishment of a U.N. "peacekeeping force."

Since the U.N. still recognizes the Khmer Rouge as the government of Kampuchea, its pretense to neutrality is hardly very convincing.

The original text of the conference resolution included a call for the disarmament of "all factions" in Kampuchea—thus equating the legitimate government in Pnom Penh with Pol Pot's murder gangs. But the final draft was even more favorable to Pol Pot. It failed to include any call whatsoever for disarming his Khmer Rouge counterrevolutionaries.

U.S. diplomats attributed this deletion to pressure from the Chinese representatives, but it was fully in accord with Washington's own objectives. During a recent visit to China,

U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig "urged China to increase arms deliveries to anti-Vietnamese resistance forces in Kampuchea," the June 26 *Far Eastern Economic Review* reported.

But the U.N. conference had what even the *New York Times* called "an air of unreality." At the July 10 solidarity meeting, Fred Feldman had explained why this would be so:

"The United States got the United Nations to ask the Vietnamese to leave [Kampuchea]. They got the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to ask the Vietnamese to leave. But their big problem is that they can't get any of the Kampuchean people to ask the Vietnamese to leave. In fact, the Kampuchean people insist that the Vietnamese stay until the danger is over."

Abe Weisburd of the CSVNKL reported that during a visit to Kampuchea in May 1980, he was told repeatedly by Kampuchean people that "the Vietnamese saved our lives."

"I would have been dead" had the Vietnamese not aided in ousting Pol Pot's regime, one Kampuchean told Weisburd.

The reason for such sentiments was obvious from the display of color slides from Kampuchea that Chan Bun Han presented to the July 10 meeting. On the one hand were scenes of ruin and destruction, piles of human bones unearthed from mass graves, and the torture chambers of Pol Pot's main prison on the outskirts of Pnom Penh.

The slides showed that legacy is now being replaced: there were scenes of children in classrooms, football games, dancing, religious festivals, clowns, weddings, Buddhist ceremonies, crowded marketplaces.

"In just the past year our country was able to produce 1.2 million tons of rice," Chan Bun Han said. "And now we are nearly self-sufficient again."

But the scars left by Pol Pot's tyranny are

still deep. Among the color slides were drawings made by children in orphanages that depicted massacres and the 1975 forced evacuation of Pnom Penh by Pol Pot's forces.

Hung Tran of the Association of Vietnamese Patriots in the United States outlined the progress achieved in the five years since the April 1975 victory over U.S. imperialism and its local puppets, and the problems his country still faced. Vietnam—"a country at peace but threatened by war"—faces three central tasks, Hung Tran said: to strive to build socialism throughout the country, to safeguard national independence, and "to do our internationalist duty toward Kampuchea, Laos, and other peoples fighting for their liberation."

In carrying out these tasks, Tran said, "we look to our friends, especially those in the United States."

Earlier, Fred Feldman had pointed to the "debt of gratitude humanity owes the revolutions in Indochina":

"In this country they inspired Blacks, women, youth, and working people with a new willingness to fight for justice and their rights; they showed the peoples of the world that change and progress can be made and freedom can be won if you are willing to stick it out. Above all, they made the American people aware that we can stop the warmakers."

"If the U.S. has not been able to start a 'new Vietnam,'" Feldman continued, "it's because of the sacrifices the Vietnamese, Laotian, and Kampuchean people made and the antiwar sentiment that they inspired here."

"So we have a continued duty of solidarity. What can we do? I think everyone here should support the activities of groups like the CSVNKL and others that are working to get out the truth and to aid Indochina. We have to demand that the embargo be lifted, that all military threats be dropped, and that massive food aid be provided."

"Despite great adversity," Feldman concluded, "the peoples of Indochina are winning. And we must support them, because every gain they make helps us in the United States to make this a country where the battle against poverty, inequality, and injustice will also be won." □



Hung Tran of the Association of Vietnamese Patriots in the United States.

Lou Howort/Militant