

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

combined
with **inprecor**

Vol. 20, No. 4

February 8, 1982

USA \$1.25 UK 50p



Peasants in southern Vietnam mobilize to build irrigation canal in rice-growing lowlands. Washington is trying to starve out Vietnamese people.

***Vietnam:* U.S. Puts Revolution Under Siege**

**Grenada Sets 1982 as 'Year
of Economic Construction'**

**Documents of Polish
Workers' Resistance**

Reagan's New Escalation of War Against El Salvador

Reagan pushes new escalation of U.S. role in El Salvador

By Will Reissner

As it becomes increasingly clear that the guerrilla forces of El Salvador's Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN) are gaining in their struggle to topple that country's ruling junta, the Reagan administration is significantly escalating its military and economic support to the junta.

On January 28, only one day after reporters from the *Washington Post* and *New York Times* provided details of a massacre of hundreds of peasants in Morazán province by the Salvadoran army, President Reagan sent the U.S. Congress a message certifying that the human rights situation in El Salvador is improving and warrants a continuation of U.S. military and economic aid.

The January 31 *New York Times* reported that the Reagan administration will ask Congress to increase U.S. military and economic aid to the Salvadoran junta this year by \$100 million over the present level of \$135 million, and will ask for some \$300 million in aid for fiscal 1983, which begins in October.

The increased aid request is part of a vast commitment by the Reagan administration to strengthen the Salvadoran military. On January 9, the first of some 1,600 Salvadoran troops — nearly one-tenth of the total strength of the Salvadoran army — arrived in the United States to begin training in counterinsurgency and infantry techniques at Ft. Bragg, North Carolina, and Ft. Benning, Georgia.

There are already fifty-six U.S. counterinsurgency advisers in El Salvador training Salvadoran troops. Another twenty-one U.S. advisers are in Honduras, coordinating the Honduran army's participation in the military campaign against the Salvadoran insurgents.

Massacre at Mozote

Reagan's certification of human rights progress in El Salvador stands in total contradiction to the murderous reality of the junta's policies. On January 27 the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* both carried accounts of a massacre in which as many as 926 peasants were murdered by the U.S.-trained Atlacatl Brigade in Mozote, in Morazán province.

Washington Post reporter Alma Guillermoprieto wrote from Mozote that "several hundred civilians, including women and children, were taken from their homes in and around this village and killed by Salvadoran Army troops during a December offensive against leftist guerrillas, according to three survivors" who witnessed the killings.

Guillermoprieto added that when she visited the now-deserted village "dozens of decomposing bodies still were seen beneath the rubble and lying in nearby fields, despite the

month that had passed since the incident."

New York Times reporter Raymond Bonner also visited Mozote. In the January 27 *Times* he wrote that "in some 20 mud brick huts here, this reporter saw the charred skulls and bones of dozens of bodies buried under burned-out roofs, beams and shattered tiles. There were more along the trail leading through the hills into the village, and at the edge of a nearby cornfield were the remains of 14 young men, women and children."

According to Bonner, villagers compiled a list of 733 people, "mostly children, women and old people," who were murdered. According to the Human Rights Commission of El Salvador, which works with the Roman Catholic church, the total number of dead was 926.

Although Morazán province is an FMLN stronghold, Mozote was not considered a pro-rebel village. One of the survivors explained to Bonner that people had not fled because "we trusted the army."

A peasant told Bonner that although he had not sympathized with the guerrillas before the Atlacatl Brigade moved in, now "I want my wife and children to go to Honduras, but I am going to stay and fight."

In a January 31 editorial, the *New York Times* noted that "one measure of America's painful predicament in El Salvador is the cynical humbug it inspires. With a straight face, the Reagan administration now certifies that El Salvador's record on human rights justifies more American aid."

The editorial acknowledges that "without more aid, Marxist guerrillas might well rout the junta's repressive armies and install a regime the United States deems unacceptable." But the *Times* editors worry that since "the Reagan administration has clearly failed to restrain the murderous armies," their massacres make it hard to defend U.S. military involvement.

The following day, the *Times* reported on a Salvadoran army death squad rampage in San Salvador in which nineteen civilians were dragged out of their homes and shot to death.

Scorched earth policy

These massacres are not isolated incidents. As the guerrillas increase the area under their control, the Salvadoran army has embarked on a scorched earth policy. The Human Rights Commission of El Salvador has charged the army with killing large numbers of civilians during military sweeps on a number of occasions. According to the commission, more than 100 peasants were killed in northern Cabañas province during a November sweep by the Atlacatl Brigade; 143 people, mostly children, were killed in San Vicente in October;

and some 300 in Usulután in September.

Several days before Reagan's certification letter was sent to the U.S. Congress, a 275-page report by the American Civil Liberties Union and the Americas Watch Committee charged the Salvadoran government with responsibility for 12,501 murders in 1981 alone, based on statistics compiled by the legal office of the San Salvador diocese of the Catholic church.

Not only do U.S.-trained troops carry out massacres of civilians, but U.S. advisers are present during training sessions where opponents of the regime are tortured and murdered.

In a January 11 dispatch from Mexico City, Raymond Bonner of the *Times* reported on an interview he conducted with a former Salvadoran soldier, Carlos Antonio Gómez Montano, who stated that U.S. military advisers were present at two "training sessions" he attended where suspected guerrillas were tortured by Salvadoran army instructors.

According to Gómez, a former paratrooper, the U.S. advisers made no effort to stop the torture of a seventeen-year-old boy and thirteen-year-old girl, who were subsequently killed and dumped on a San Salvador street. Gómez charged that the Salvadoran Army routinely mutilated the bodies of suspects and dropped some people alive into the sea from helicopters, a technique also used by U.S. forces in Vietnam to loosen the tongues of the remaining prisoners.

Land reform stymied

The Reagan administration also asserted to Congress that the Salvadoran junta is making progress on its land reform program. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The junta's land reform plan, designed by U.S. counterinsurgency expert Roy Prosterman (who designed a similar program for South Vietnam), was carried out under the control of the military and provided the pretext for the military occupation of the Salvadoran countryside.

In a December report to Salvadoran President José Napoleón Duarte, the executive board of the U.S.-financed Unión Comunal Salvadoreña (UCS) acknowledged that the land reform program is near collapse because of military-backed terror and murder, illegal peasant evictions, and a "frequently hostile" government bureaucracy.

According to the report, at least ninety officials of peasant organizations and "a large number of beneficiaries" of the land reform program "have died during 1981 at the hands of the ex-landlords and their allies, who are often members of the local security forces." In addition, more than 25,000 peasants have been evicted from their farms, "in the majority of cases with the assistance of members of the military forces," according to the UCS report.

Free elections?

As for Reagan's certification that progress is being made toward free elections in El Salvador, it should be noted that in the scheduled

March 28 voting for a constituent assembly, leftist opponents of the junta are unable to run since they would face certain death at the hands of the military and death squads.

The election is a farce and is recognized as such throughout the world — except in Washington, where the Reagan administration views it as a key justification for its counterinsurgency program.

In an interview with Christopher Dickey in the January 31 *Washington Post*, U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador Deane Hinton acknowledged that the March 28 election would make no difference and will not provide a political solution to the war. Whatever new government takes office, he said, will attempt to win a military victory over the guerrillas, although Hinton is increasingly pessimistic about its ability to achieve that goal.

Hinton's pessimism is well justified. The growing strength of the guerrillas was dramatically demonstrated on January 27, just one day before Reagan's certification letter was presented to the U.S. Congress. Freedom fighters penetrated the Ilopango air base outside the capital city of San Salvador, and destroyed half the Salvadoran air force in one blow. The guerrillas then withdrew without suffering a single casualty.

U.S. reporters on the scene in El Salvador have made it clear that the guerrillas are winning their war against the junta's troops.

Washington Post reporter John Dinges spent time in early January in a guerrilla camp just outside the provincial capital of Usulután, a densely populated area of coffee and cotton farms. Dinges wrote in the January 22 *Post* that "there are approximately 600 people at the camp and 5,000 peasants living in the surrounding rural area the camp controls. . . ."

An afternoon tour of the camp convinced Dinges that this was "a highly trained guerrilla force that was adequately fed and armed with automatic weapons. Discipline and morale appeared high, and the guerrillas made no effort to conceal the camp buildings from detection from the air.

Dinges concluded that "the existence of the Usulután camp and its apparently secure position demonstrates the Salvadoran Army's scant success in preventing guerrillas from holding territory or their expansion into new areas of the country."

New York Times reporter Raymond Bonner spent several weeks traveling in the province of Morazán with guerrillas of the FMLN. In the January 26 *New York Times*, Bonner noted that in Morazán:

Even in the daylight, armed guerrillas walk along the paved road that connects Perquín and San Francisco Gotera [the provincial capital]. Buses and trucks that travel the roads sometimes stop to offer them a lift or to give them oranges or other food.

Commander Jonás, the 28-year-old guerrilla commander for Morazán, says that about 60,000 peasants live in the zone, where the guerrillas have set up schools for children, health clinics and hospitals, military schools and a radio station. Peasants are cul-

tivating corn, sugar cane, beans and other crops and grazing cattle.

The revolutionaries' control is sufficient to enable them to hold large ceremonies in open fields. At a ceremony that honored the graduates of the military school's fifth class, the shouting of such revolutionary slogans as "If Vietnam won, we will win!" reverberated in the hills.

U.S. Ambassador Deane Hinton admitted that the major army offensive launched in December to drive the guerrillas out of Morazán province, during which the Mozote massacre took place, was a failure. "That was a big operation," said Hinton. "Over 20 companies. It's the biggest one they ever mounted, and with some of the fewest results, too."

Francisco Altschul, a representative of the

Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR) of El Salvador, noted in a January 22 speech in New York that the guerrillas now operate in thirteen of El Salvador's fourteen provinces, and exercise political and military control over large areas of the provinces of Chalatenango, Cabanñas, San Vicente, Morazán, Cuscatlán, Usulután, San Miguel, and La Unión.

The Reagan administration's response to the growing strength of the FMLN has been to step up its aid to the murderous junta, in hopes that the Salvadoran military can drown the insurgency in the blood of the workers and peasants. A massive campaign is needed within the United States and around the world to demand an end to all U.S. intervention in El Salvador. □

IN THIS ISSUE

Closing News Date: February 1, 1982

GRENADA	76	A struggle to develop the economy — by Pat Kane
	77	Phone company taken over
ST. LUCIA	78	'Government of national unity' formed — by Baxter Smith
GUATEMALA	79	Massacre of refugees — by David Gollob
PUERTO RICO	80	Interview with leader of Vieques fishermen
	81	Reagan pushes for statehood — by Nelson González
VIETNAM	82	The revolution under siege — by David Frankel
	83	War 'finally stops' for four U.S. veterans
LAOS	86	Washington's secret war — by Harry Ring
KAMPUCHEA	88	Interview with leader of Front for National Salvation
CENTRAL AMERICA	96	Proimperialist alliance formed — by Arnold Weissberg
COSTA RICA	96	Banana workers strike
DOCUMENTS	89	Union activists organize resistance
STATEMENT OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL	91	Imperialist remilitarization and the struggle against austerity, for peace and socialism
NEWS ANALYSIS	74	Reagan pushes new escalation of U.S. role in El Salvador — by Will Reissner

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

Editor: Steve Clark.
Contributing Editors: Pierre Frank, Livio Mai-tan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.
Managing Editor: David Frankel.
Editorial Staff: Sue Hagen, Ernest Harsch, Fred Murphy, Will Reissner.
Business Manager: Sandi Sherman.

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 subscription 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; or telephone: (212) 929-6933.

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 8852, 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.

A struggle to develop the economy

1982 set as 'year of economic construction'

By Pat Kane

ST GEORGE'S — The revolutionary government of Grenada has announced a whole series of economic measures to increase the Caribbean island's productivity.

Selwyn Strachan, minister of national mobilization, told the first meeting this year of the St. George's Workers Parish Council, "this year is going to be a really tough year. Just as we moved with vigor and vitality in 1981 to get all the democratic and mass organizations moving, just as we moved with speed and force to push aside counterrevolution, so we will be moving with equal vigor to ensure that the economy moves forward."

Economic progress

Already the government has made considerable progress toward breaking the island's economic dependence on the international capitalist market. But the collapse of cocoa, nutmeg, and banana prices has severely affected the country's struggle to develop its economy.

1981 saw the development of Grenada's mass organizations, in particular the National Youth Organization and the National Women's Organization, and the extension of the system of "people's democracy" that allows the vast majority of Grenadians to participate in the running of their country. These democratic institutions will be instrumental in solving the island's economic problems.

The government has developed an asphalt plant to construct the runway of the new international airport and to carry out road repairs. The island's roads were neglected for years before the revolution, making it almost impossible to repair them.

Last year the government also opened the first agroindustrial plant, canning fruits and fruit drinks. A housing program and free primary health care were all established in 1981.

This is on top of the benefits in education,

Pat Kane is in Grenada on assignment for *Intercontinental Press*. He will be reporting on the progress of the revolution there, and will be in Grenada through the celebration of the third anniversary of the revolution on March 13.

Kane, who is from Scotland, is an electrician who has been active in the British labor movement. He is a former staff writer for *Socialist Challenge*, a weekly newspaper published in London that reflects the views of the International Marxist Group, the British section of the Fourth International.



Minister of National Mobilisation Selwyn Strachan speaking before meeting of St. George's Workers Parish Council in August 1981. Mass participation is a cornerstone of revolutionary government's economic development strategy.

new agricultural cooperatives, and a reduction of 25 percent in the island's unemployment since the revolution.

John Ventour, secretary of the Grenadian Trade Union Congress, pointed out to the hundreds of workers present at the Workers Parish Council meeting that "none of this would have been possible without the revolutionary and internationalist policy of the people and government of Cuba."

Ventour continued, "Before the revolution, when our party in its 1973 manifesto talked about the people owning the banks, they said that this was fly-by-night promises to get support, that we could never run a bank. After two years, the National Commercial Bank has shown that our workers, our Grenadian people, can run a bank successfully, and even make a million [Eastern Caribbean] dollars profit" (EC\$1 = US\$0.37).

This profit is divided three ways — among the workers, the government, and the company — as are all profits in the state sector.

These past economic measures, coupled with the huge extension of the mass organizations and the aid from the Cuban revolution, are the foundations of the present campaign to increase production and efficiency during 1982.

'Hurricane Gairy'

The Grenadian revolutionaries have had to struggle against distinct economic problems: the criminal state of the prerevolutionary ad-

ministration, the impact of the international capitalist crisis, and the attempts of the U.S. and British governments to block aid to the island's various projects.

Grenada was mismanaged by the dictator Eric Gairy until his overthrow in 1979. He is now resident in San Diego, California — a status that thousands of Haitians fleeing state terror in their country and trying to enter the United States must envy.

Gairy fell from power in 1962 in part because of a corruption scandal, but he returned in 1967. Just weeks earlier he had been about to be declared bankrupt as a result of seventeen court cases for debt. Twelve years later, at the time of the March 13, 1979, revolution, his personal fortune had grown to an estimated \$8 million. The revolutionary government estimates that it saved \$2.5 million in the first year of the revolution by eliminating waste and corruption.

Gairy wrecked the island's economy and allowed multinational companies a free hand in basic services like electricity, gas, and oil. He ran down the hospital to such an extent that Grenadians say that if you needed aspirin while in the hospital, you had to go out and buy it yourself. The whole era can be summed up as "Hurricane Gairy."

The revolutionary government tackled these problems head on. Its starting point was that the involvement of the workers and general population would overcome the initial material

problems. Prime Minister Maurice Bishop is often heard to say that "our people are our resources."

Cuban aid

Aid from Cuba was also instrumental in consolidating the revolution.

When the Cuban volunteers first arrived in Grenada, the local people did not know what to expect. Under Gairy, it was a punishable offense to visit or support Cuba. They had been fed with all the usual propaganda lies to discredit the Cuban revolution.

One woman, who runs a restaurant for dock and truck workers, described to me what happened when the Cubans first arrived: "When they got here, everyone said they would be running around with guns. People from the country were told that in St. George's there were armed Cubans on every street corner. We did not see them at first. We soon found out that was because they were working night and day building the airport.

"I have never seen a Cuban with a gun. Every time I see one he has got a stethoscope, a book, or tools in his hands. And they are always dirty from hard work."

Cubans are now welcome guests in Grenada.

The international economic crisis has had its effects here. Cocoa prices have fallen to less than half the price of two years ago. Nutmeg prices have fallen, although, through increased technical aid to farmers, there was a bumper crop last year. Grenadian banana farmers get only EC\$0.12 (US\$0.04) per pound from the British company Geest. Geest insists on special packaging that costs EC\$0.10 per pound.

While export prices fall, costs of imports of oil and other goods spiral through inflation.

Tourism has been partially affected by the imperialist propaganda campaign against the Grenada revolution. In a random sample of the American press, the Grenadian mission in New York found that there were 169 articles in one month attacking Grenada. A mysterious fire damaged the island's Holiday Inn on the eve of the International Solidarity Conference last November, causing holiday cancellations.

Despite past and present difficulties, the Grenadian economy has shown considerable growth since the revolution. According to the International Monetary Fund, which is no friend of revolutions, in 1981 there was 5.5% growth in agriculture, 20% in quarrying, 14.5% in construction, and a growth of 2% in

gross national product. This is all on a tiny island with only 133 square miles, and a population of just 120,000.

This growth has been achieved because of the political outlook of the government. Revolutionary measures have been taken in the countryside and towns. Mass participation and control are the cornerstones of the government's strategy.

But despite these successes, 1982 has been designated as the "Year of Economic Construction." With the continuation of the capitalist crisis and the campaign to isolate Grenada by the imperialists, further efforts and sacrifices must be made to develop the economy.

Food imports now total a massive \$22 million. Scientific cultivation of just 350 acres of the island's arable land could eliminate the need for food imports. As the international recession continues, lack of revenue could result in a budget deficit in 1982-83.

So the government has decided to act to place the economy at the center of activity of all the mass organizations. A series of measures have been announced that will be discussed throughout the island in parish council, union, youth, and women's meetings.

New economic proposals

Each workplace will be setting up production committees to monitor and set production

targets. They will aim to participate in the growing movement toward planning within the workplace.

New grievance and discipline committees are being established to link any work grievances to the task of increased production. A political education campaign is planned to increase work discipline.

An emulation system will be established to recognize the island's most outstanding workers. This will include certificates and prizes. While the revolution will continue to stress the moral and political motivation for increased production, cash incentives of \$25 will be paid to the most outstanding workers.

These measures are to be linked to the island's first one-year national plan and the new budget, which are currently being prepared through the various mass organizations. Elections are now underway for delegates to attend a special conference of mass organizations to discuss the economy.

After the parish council meeting in St. George's, a worker from the asphalt plant told me that if U.S. workers were allowed as much discussion on their government's budget, he was sure they would not spend as much money on arms and nuclear weapons.

This will be a year of challenge for the revolutionary people of Grenada and their government. □

Grenada takes over phone company

The People's Revolutionary Government (PRG) of Grenada is now the sole owner of the island's telephone company. The formal transfer of ownership took place at a ceremony in St. George's on January 19.

The company — Grenada Telephones — was jointly owned by the PRG and a giant U.S. company, Continental Telephones, Ltd. Negotiations with the company followed a proposal by Continental that the PRG buy Continental's 50 percent shareholding. Because of the poor state of the telephone equipment and the level of company debts the PRG would have to repay, the government bought all of the Continental shares for the price of *one dollar*.

The government's final decision came after it informed Continental that the sale would have to meet the total approval of the telephone workers and staff.

Minister of Communications and Works Hudson Austin explained the background to this historic move and the government's decision to respect the views of the workers concerned. "After discussion with the workers," he said, "they were informed that if the workers did not agree to the transfer we would not sign the agreement. But we have the support from all the workers that the government should take over."

Frederick Grant, a telephone worker, expressed the feelings of the other workers when he spoke at the formal ceremony. "The workers are glad that the government has taken over the company," he said. "We feel that for once in our lives we realize that what we put into the company, we will get out. We realize that we have to put in an extra amount of production, but we will be able to call it our company.

"Our company must be run by us. We feel strongly, and we appreciate the stand that the revolutionary government has made, and the preparations in sending four of our engineers away for training in advance of a new system coming. We want to make this company a success, because it now belongs to us."

The PRG has already begun to implement plans for the upgrading of the island's telephone system, and is installing a new system from the German Democratic Republic. People are optimistic that under government control the company will be able to give more reliable service. The service has been run down over the past few years, and is now considered obsolete.

The move to take over Grenada Telephones is similar to the government's purchase last year of Grenlec, the island's electricity company.

— Pat Kane

Intercontinental Press

Intercontinental Press is a unique source for political developments throughout the world.

\$35 for one year.

\$17.50 for six months.

410 West Street
New York, N.Y. 10014

'Government of national unity' formed

Eruption of mass anger forces out previous regime

By Baxter Smith

CASTRIES — Beset with a virtual island-wide shutdown by labor and business, the eight-month-old St. Lucia Labour Party (SLP) government of Prime Minister Winston Cenac collapsed January 17.

Thirty-four-year-old Progressive Labour Party (PLP) member Michael Pilgrim was sworn in as interim prime minister until new elections could be held.

On January 15 Cenac (pronounced snack) announced he would resign and that leaders of the SLP, PLP, and the United Workers Party (UWP) had agreed to the formation of a "government of national unity" composed of those parties. Pilgrim said he would also include private individuals.

The UWP later balked at inclusion of the SLP in the "national unity" government, but it eventually relented.

Corruption and favoritism

Cenac's resignation culminated a week of the sharpest crisis his administration had faced in its long-running public feud with the UWP and PLP.

The crisis was provoked on January 11 when the Cenac majority announced its intention to introduce into the House of Assembly a bill that would extend from one to eighteen months the time allowed members of the House to account for money they received in advance from the treasury for overseas trips.

Another part of the bill would allow members to fill business contracts for the government without disqualifying them from the House. Presently, this is illegal.

The opposition UWP and PLP said this bill was an attempt by the SLP majority to legitimize corruption and favoritism.

PLP leader George Odium reacted to mention of the bill by grabbing the House Speaker's mace and tossing it to Pilgrim, who hurled it into the gallery.

Odium said later: "Because those [Cenac] men were corrupting the House of Assembly we were returning the mace to the people. What we have started today is to mash up not the House of Assembly but the government."

Meanwhile, in the legislature, arguments erupted on the floor which spilled over into the gallery and streets outside. Armed police burst into the chamber and broke up the session.

As news of the police action spread around town, knots of people gathered on the streets.

Capitalists back UWP

The Chamber of Commerce, which had long been agitating for the removal of the SLP government, wasted little time in urging its

member merchants to close their doors until the bill was withdrawn.

In the December 19 issue of the capitalist weekly *Voice*, Chamber of Commerce President Orman Monplaisir complained that the SLP government had given capitalist interests "absolutely no encouragement" for local investment. He charged that the liquidity of commercial banks had dried up because of "unconventional" financial practices by the government.

There have also been claims that the government is bankrupt and has a poor standing with international lending institutions.

The Chamber of Commerce and business leaders have made no secret of their desire to return the UWP to power. The UWP ran the country from 1964 to 1979. It is a capitalist party and maintains that strong U.S. and other foreign capitalist investment in the economy is the road to progress.

The PLP was formed in May 1981 after splitting from the SLP. Some here view it as more radical than the SLP.

George Odium, in an interview published in the January 9 issue of the *Crusader*, the PLP newspaper, said that a PLP government would

A case of real censorship

CASTRIES — For months now, radio listeners up and down the Caribbean have been bombarded with false claims of censorship in Grenada.

If they could only check out St. Lucia.

Radio St. Lucia here is controlled so tightly by the government that St. Lucians had to tune in stations on other islands for news about the crisis.

On its "News Nationwide" program on January 15, at the height of the crisis, Radio St. Lucia broadcast one short item about the Port Authority closing due to a strike by dockworkers.

The situation was so bad that the Civil Service Association advised its striking workers to listen to Radio Antilles, broadcasting from Montserrat, for strike news.

Not until the day after the government had fallen — "in response to numerous telephone calls," was how the broadcaster phrased it — did the station report on the government's resignation.

Meanwhile, listeners in Grenada were kept up to date on St. Lucia events with informative, periodic reports on Radio Free Grenada.

— B.S.

be "progressive with a socialist flavour." He pointed to reforms that have been carried out in Britain and Trinidad as an example of what he would advocate.

Power of unions

The day after the Chamber of Commerce call for a protest by merchants, leaders of four unions — the National Workers Union, the St. Lucia Workers Union, the Civil Service Association, and the St. Lucia Teachers' Union — signed a letter to Cenac also demanding the bill be withdrawn.

That night, January 12, Cenac went on radio and TV.

He defended his administration and concluded: "My government considers it its duty to pay attention to the advice of persons who are not motivated by personal ambitions but who seek, like my government, the welfare of the workers at large."

Therefore, because he was requested by the unions, Cenac said he was withdrawing the bill from the House.

The Chamber of Commerce was later joined in the business shutdown by the Small Businessmen's Association and the St. Lucia Manufacturers Association. They pressed for the dissolution of parliament and Cenac's removal.

The four protesting unions were joined by the Seamen and Waterfront Workers Union. They also upped their demands, calling for the government's resignation and urging their members to strike.

After hearing the new demands of the unions, Cenac changed his tune about what he considered his administration's "duty." In an angry radio broadcast January 14, he attacked the unions and claimed they had "no grounds whatsoever for the actions." He declined to step down.

Meanwhile, schools, airports, and seaports were closing as workers failed to show up. Telecommunications workers walked out, cutting links with the outside world.

Under this pressure, Cenac finally resigned.

'National Unity' government

Many people here and around the Caribbean are putting stock in the ability of the "national unity" government to solve St. Lucia's problems. Dominica Prime Minister Mary Eugenia Charles and Antigua Deputy Prime Minister Lester Bird, both strongly proimperialist, saluted it and breathed sighs of relief that the crisis here ended with capitalist rule intact.

In his January 12 national address, Cenac pointed out how the SLP had grown out of the unions and led the country in anticolonial

struggles against the British in the 1950s.

"What happened to that movement?" he asked.

What happened was a change in the political situation.

In the 1950s St. Lucia was struggling under British colonialism. These struggles resulted in formal political independence, but today the island's economy is still shackled to imperialism.

In this sense, St. Lucia is little different from other English-speaking Caribbean countries with ruling labor parties. In many cases these parties were built on the unions in the

struggle against British colonialism, but their leaderships have become ossified and out of step with the needs of working people.

It is only in Grenada — under the New Jewel Movement, a new generation of militants — where strides have been made in breaking imperialist domination.

Given the magnitude of St. Lucia's problems, there are fears among business circles here that St. Lucia could eventually "go the Grenada route." The massive eruption of anger that forced out the Cenac regime shows that working people here are not about to put up indefinitely with the abuses they suffer. □

Guatemala

Massacre of refugees

By David Gollob

[The following article appeared in the December 11, 1981, issue of the British social-democratic weekly *New Statesman*.]

* * *

Hidden in the tropical rain forests of Guatemala, death of the cruelest sort is becoming commonplace for the Indians who have survived for centuries as peasant farmers. "In our village," reports one woman, now a refugee in Mexico, "800 soldiers came and seized some of our people and nailed them up in front of the people like they did to our Lord, and all the people watching." The right-wing military government of Romeo Lucas Garcia is fighting its guerrilla opposition with such indiscriminate violence that it is now being charged with genocide — the wholesale massacre of peasants in some areas to discourage them from supporting the guerrillas. Earlier this week, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights singled out Guatemala and El Salvador as having, in an area where civil liberties are consistently denied, the worst record of violating human rights.

"Maybe the soldiers get money to kill people," said another refugee. "That's why they kill without knowing if they are killing guerrillas or not. We are defenceless." "The Guatemalan army only teach you one thing," said Manuel, a young Indian who spent two years in the army. "How to kill. When you go out on a street patrol they tell you, just kill who you want if you think they're against us." Manuel says he never killed anyone. "But I did have to beat people up when on guard duty on the plantations. We had to make sure the peasants worked and didn't make trouble. The land belonged to a General you see."

When he returned to his village in Quiché in the north, he saw the killing. "The soldiers came to our village in the middle of the night. They forced everyone to leave their houses and assemble in the square. Then they picked out

40 young men at random and lined them up against a wall. They said they were guerrillas and then they riddled them with bullets. They said the same would happen to us if we helped the guerrillas. There was a terrible silence except for the women who were crying. Then they told us to shout 'long live the army.' We all shouted 'long live the army.'"

The Indians tell of wholesale destruction of villages bombed by planes and helicopters, the theft of their corn and livestock, the rape of women and girls — and the same indiscriminate slaughter. The Guatemalan press confirms the destruction but puts the blame on *desconocidos* — persons unknown.

The villagers may be politically naive — but they know who is attacking them. Several of the refugees who are camping out in southern Mexico describe the massacre of San Mateo Ixtatán last June, which the government blamed on the guerrillas: "56 people were killed, from babies to a 100-year-old man. They come at night, they come at three or four in the morning. They surround your house, they break down the door and kill your family. I think these soldiers are very evil. That's why people are afraid."

In their stories of massacre and torture, one word dominates, repeated over and over like a ritual lament: *Miedo, miedo, miedo*. Fear. Many claim they have been personally threatened with death because their children have fled to the mountains and "people say they are guerrillas now." Others say that the repression has made them sympathetic to the guerrillas, casting doubt on a governing party deputy's claim that "60 percent of the peasantry are collaborating with the army." None of the refugees says he or she has been the victim of guerrilla aggression.

Around 40,000 peasants have succeeded in reaching Mexico, but they find no secure refuge there. 500 were sent back in February. In April, after a 17-day march through the forest,

carrying nothing but their children and their fear, 500 more were picked up by the Mexican authorities, and held in a transit camp for 23 days. They were then handed over to the Guatemalan army, who were reported to be "looking after them." If local testimony is correct, all, including the 180 children, have been massacred.

Asked why 500 peasants should leave everything behind them to walk to Mexico, the government issued a host of contradictory statements. The Ministry of Labour said such "migrations" were normal at harvest time. Francisco Djalma Dominguez, head of Army public relations, said the episode was part of an international campaign to discredit the regime. Carlos Toledo Vielma, public relations chief for the presidency, was quoted in a Mexican newspaper as saying the refugees were terrorists running from the law and, later, naive peasants "politically manipulated by subversives." As none appears to have survived, the refugees' version cannot be told.

In July, 1,800 refugees were transported by the Mexican authorities to a border crossing. In order to return to their villages they would have to have got through the security cordons in the provinces of Quiché and Huehuetango. Diplomatic sources say many of the refugees were massacred.

These deportations by the Mexican government defy international conventions on the treatment of refugees, and in August the UN High Commission on Refugees intervened, urging the Mexican government to accept the commission's criteria for determining refugee status. Mexico is not a signatory of the 1951 Geneva Convention on refugees, but it is a member of the Organisation of American States and a signatory to the San José Pact which lays down that refugees should not be deported when this puts their lives in jeopardy. Mexico has traditionally provided asylum for those fleeing political persecution in Latin America. But its asylum mechanism is designed for small professional elites presenting themselves at their embassies abroad, not for masses of illiterate people, speaking little-known native languages, starving on the country's borders.

The Mexican cabinet appears to be bitterly divided on the issue, though the government realises that if it takes a hard line on the refugees, it could weaken its own bargaining position over the fate of illegal Mexican immigrants in the USA.

It has now conceded an administrative amnesty, meaning that although official policy is the same, in practice transit centres will be set up with UN participation to cope with thousands of Guatemalans as they come out of hiding. At the least, this means refugees are not being handed straight back to the Guatemalan army. But inside the country, the terror continues. The "Indians" of Guatemala are 60 per cent of the population and no effective move has been made internationally to protect them from the genocidal actions of their government. □

'U.S. Navy must leave'

Interview with leader of Vieques fishermen

[The following interview with Carlos Zenón, leader of the Association of Fishermen of Vieques, an island six miles off the east coast of Puerto Rico, originally appeared in the January 25, 1982, issue of *Perspectiva Mundial*, a socialist fortnightly published in New York. The interview has been slightly abridged.]

[The U.S. Navy and Marines occupy three-quarters of the land surface of Vieques, using the island for naval gunnery practice, close air support training, and air-to-ground exercises. As a result, the residents of the island live in constant proximity to artillery fire, exploding bombs, and strafing jets.]

[In addition, huge amounts of ammunition and weapons are stored in hollowed-out mountains for use by the Atlantic fleet in any conflict involving Africa or Central or South America.]

[The interview with Carlos Zenón was conducted by Herminia Cruz, co-coordinator of the Vieques Support Committee of Hartford, Connecticut, during a tour that Zenón made to gather support for the struggle of the people of Vieques against the U.S. Navy's occupation of their island. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Question. Zenón, can you tell us why the people of Vieques are involved in a struggle against the U.S. Navy?

Answer. This struggle has been building up for years. Since the U.S. Navy came to Vieques in 1940, our people have suffered a number of blows.

First there was the expropriation of land when the U.S. Navy took over 26,000 of the 33,000 cuerdas [one cuerda = one acre] of land on the island.

The Navy set the price for the land belonging to the people of Vieques, even though they did not want to sell it. If anyone resisted the sale of their property, they were given twenty-four hours to move off it and take the price the Navy wanted to pay.

Later, in the 1950s, our young people were the victims of attacks, murders, and outrages. In the 1960s the abuses on the island continued to get worse, and in the 1970s, areas of the sea were declared off-limits to the fishermen.

Fishing is the only industry that has any real importance on the island, since the Navy caused the disappearance of sugar cane and agriculture. All we have now are a few jobs with the municipality and in two factories.

Q. What is the situation on Vieques in social and economic terms as a result of its occupa-

tion by the U.S. Navy?

A. The U.S. Navy has the island of Vieques in an economic and social stranglehold. The plans that exist for development of the island are impossible to implement because of the Navy's presence. Since the Navy expropriated the property of the people on Vieques, the population has dropped from 14,000 to the present 8,000. This is due to the small area left for civilian use. Our population lives on 7,000 cuerdas. Therefore we cannot even practice agriculture because of the large number of people living in that small area.

The unemployment rate has risen to 64 percent, and 75 percent of the families live on food stamps. We do not have colleges for our youth, and those that can must leave Vieques to continue their university studies.

We do not have hospitals. When women are going to have a baby they have to go to the big island [Puerto Rico] by plane.

In addition, as you know, our people live by fishing, and the continuous use of our waters by the U.S. Navy will ruin that industry. When these ships come into the 100-foot-deep waters where we fishermen have our traps, the ships' propellers destroy the buoys that indicate where our traps are. When that happens it is hard for us to find the traps. As a result, the trap stays on the bottom for eight or twelve months, attracting many fish who then die in the traps.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture made a study of these traps and found that a single trap collects from 4,500 to 5,000 pounds of fish in ten months. The U.S. Navy destroyed 131 traps in 1977, so you can imagine the damage already caused, and the damage that will continue to happen if these practices are continued.

The U.S. Navy has caused damage to the plant and animal life, and has caused erosion of the reefs as a result of the constant bombardment.

At the time of the hostages in Iran, the United States was ready to unleash the third world war. But the United States has published nothing about the 8,000 Puerto Rican hostages on Vieques. The U.S. Navy must leave, because our island wants to develop, not continue to be strangled.

Q. What is the relationship between the military bases on Vieques and the struggle of our Latin American peoples in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Cuba, and elsewhere?

A. The U.S. Navy is training personnel and carries out exercises that simulate invasions of

other countries. In 1964, for example, U.S. Marines were trained in Vieques for the intervention in Santo Domingo. They have also carried out practice invasions of Guatemala, Nicaragua, and now El Salvador. The navy recruits our young people, calling them Sea Cadets.

Because they speak Spanish and have Latin features, it is easier for them to be used to intervene in El Salvador, representing the dehumanizing policy of the United States in this brother country.

Our young people go along with this type of work because of the island's economic situation, not because of the political implications that go with it. The parents of these young people are guards trained by the Navy to act as a means of repression against the people of Vieques who struggle against the Navy.

Seven months ago, sixty-four Navy officers received special training and were sent to El Salvador. Comrade Ernesto Cardenal [the minister of culture] of Nicaragua told me that two ships that had been training in Vieques (one being the USS *Dwight*) steamed toward Nicaragua.

They are carrying out maneuvers on a scale never before seen in the forty-one years the U.S. Navy has been on Vieques. We have made a connection between these training operations and the recent news reports about possible invasions of Cuba, Nicaragua, and El Salvador.

During these maneuvers the ships sailed with their lights out and came in very close to shore, something that only very well-prepared ships can do. No U.S. Navy ship would approach the shores of Russia to invade it, but they would do this against any of our Latin American peoples.

Q. Recently it was reported in "*Perspectiva Mundial*" that a possible invasion of the island of Grenada was being prepared somewhere in the Caribbean. Can you tell us anything about this?

A. The training for this possible invasion of the island of Grenada took place on Vieques. Three months ago some maneuvers were carried out with Vieques simulating Grenada, since the topography of the two islands is very similar. Grenada also is building an airport that is similar to the U.S. airport on Vieques.

They also trained in carrying out possible aerial attacks against the people of Grenada. In fact, reports on this simulated battle were obtained and are now being debated in the United Nations General Assembly.

I have no doubt that Vieques would play a role in the naval blockade that the United States is planning against Cuba.

Q. Zenón, when the NATO force was training in Vieques in 1978, how did the people react to this training?

A. In February 1978 the Navy invited NATO and other allied navies to train for twenty-seven days in the waters of Vieques.

They sent us, the fishermen, a letter advising us that we could not fish for twenty-seven days, until the training was over.

When we tried to discuss this with Admiral Robert Fanagan, who issued the order, he told us we should go on food stamps, since the Navy had invested millions of dollars in these maneuvers and was not going to cancel them for the fishermen of Vieques.

Here we decided that for the first time in history, the U.S. Navy would have problems. We fishermen would organize ourselves and confront them, paralyzing the training operations.

Among the countries that took part were Brazil, France, Holland, Argentina, and Canada. In fact, this was not the first time that the Navy invited NATO to practice in Vieques. In 1958 the United States rented the island of Vieques to the members of NATO, charging \$1,200 per hour per ship.

Q. What kind of local, national, and international support have the people of Vieques received?

A. The struggle of Vieques is a broad struggle. On the local level there is the Crusade to Rescue Vieques, which involves all types of organizations of workers, students, fishermen, merchants, etc., that have arisen against the U.S. Navy in Vieques.

On the national level in Puerto Rico, we have the support of the churches, universities, Vieques support committees, and political parties like the Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP) and Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP). We also have the support of political leaders like Severo Colberg of the Peoples Democratic Party (PPD) and Radamés Tirado of the New Progressive Party (PNP) [the PPD and PNP are the two main political parties in Puerto Rico] and the nationalist heroes [four Puerto Rican patriots who were released in 1979 after spending more than twenty-five years in prison].

On the international level there are support committees in nearly all the states of the United States. There are also support committees in Canada, Venezuela, and Santo Domingo. In addition, since the case of Vieques is being debated at the United Nations, there are a tremendous number of countries that support the struggle of Vieques, such as the Cuban delegation, the delegation from Grenada, and others.

So with all this international, national, and local support, we will get the U.S. Navy out of Vieques, and restore peace to the island and to our brother Latin American countries.

Every day that the fishermen disrupt the U.S. Navy's training in Vieques is one fewer day the United States has for invading our Latin American peoples. □

America and the Caribbean.

Currently, 13 percent of the island's territory is used by the U.S. military for bombing ranges, facilities for nuclear weapons, naval bases, etc. Also, as part of U.S. interventionist plans in Central America, Puerto Rican advisers have been sent to Honduras to train troops.

However, it will take a lot more than presidential declarations to patch up Barceló's crisis-racked regime.

Puerto Ricans have not taken the Reagan budget offensive lying down. Leading the fightback against the Barceló regime, the students at the University of Puerto Rico have shut down the university for 140 days, refusing to accept a tripling of tuition fees and a cutback in student aid.

In a student assembly that took place on January 21 it was decided to end the strike. This is only a defensive measure on the part of the students, who fear blood will be shed if strike activities are carried out in face of a police occupation of the campus. They vowed that the struggle will continue through outreach efforts for support, and through efforts to better organize the student movement in an islandwide student federation.

Previous to this struggle, a militant strike by Puerto Rican electrical workers prevented the government's attempts to destroy their union — the Union of Electrical Industry and Irrigation Workers (UTIER). A move to lay off 800 additional workers is threatening to renew this explosive confrontation.

Two additional components of the developing fightback on the island are the refusal of the fishermen of Vieques, an island off the coast of Puerto Rico, to allow their land to be used for practice invasions and bombing practice; and the movement of *rescatadores*, who have successfully occupied land, built their own homes, and demanded government services.

This fightback has resulted in many resignations from the Barceló regime, whose party, the New Progressive Party (PNP), favors statehood. It has also caused a severe crisis in the other main capitalist party, the Popular Democratic Party (PPD), which favors the current commonwealth status.

In this context, it is no coincidence that the sentiment for independence is deepening on the island. More and more Puerto Ricans are coming to realize the need to break the chains of imperialist exploitation in order to run their country in the interests of human needs, not for the profits of U.S. bankers.

This is reflected by the fact that the main individuals and organizations leading the fightback in Puerto Rico are those that favor independence.

U.S. workers have no stake in maintaining the chains by which Washington subjugates the Puerto Rican people, whether under the present commonwealth status or statehood.

We should demand, "U.S. free Puerto Rico now" and, to make up for years of imperialist exploitation, "Unlimited aid with no strings attached." □

Reagan pushes statehood

Puerto Rico a 'bridgehead' in Caribbean?

By Nelson González

[The following article appeared in the February 5 issue of the U.S. socialist newsweekly *Militant*.]

* * *

On January 12, President Ronald Reagan issued a declaration supporting statehood for Puerto Rico.

According to United Press International, "Reagan is known to see the admission of Puerto Rico into the union as a 'bridgehead' in Central America and the Caribbean against the overtures of Cuban President Fidel Castro."

Reagan dangled two carrots to make this declaration more palatable:

- He promised that Puerto Rico as a state would be eligible for more federal aid.
- He graciously offered to allow Puerto Ricans to retain their language and culture.

Neither Puerto Ricans on the island nor U.S. workers are fooled by this offer. It comes from an administration that has gone wild slashing federal funds affecting vital social programs in the fifty states already in the union.

Especially hard hit are programs that affect Blacks and Latinos, such as bilingual-bicultural education, affirmative-action programs, and government-financed job training pro-

grams.

On top of all this, the officially estimated unemployment rate in the United States is 8.9 percent. It is 62.4 percent for Puerto Rican youth in the United States.

In Puerto Rico, unemployment is now 21.6 percent, and \$400 million in federal funds slated for vital island services has been slashed. By 1983, 50,000 Puerto Rican workers a year are expected to migrate to the United States in search of relief.

At the same time, Puerto Rican-based U.S. corporations rake in millions of dollars in super profits. In 1974, these corporations extracted more than \$1.3 billion in profits. Fully one-fifth of all the wealth created by Puerto Rican workers wound up in U.S. banks.

These are the real benefits of being a captive colony of U.S. imperialism. Reagan's proposal to make Puerto Rico a state only changes the label while seeking to deepen the exploitation of the Puerto Rican masses.

The real aim of Reagan's pronouncement is to strengthen the hand of the antilabor, anti-communist, proimperialist regime of Puerto Rican Governor Carlos Romero Barceló. This is a necessary prelude to preparing Puerto Rico as a "bridgehead" in U.S. imperialism's drive against the developing revolutions in Central

The revolution under siege

Washington tries to strangle a heroic people

By David Frankel

Vietnam today is a country under siege.

It is almost seven years since the final defeat of the U.S.-backed dictatorship in South Vietnam, but Washington has never given up its vendetta against the Vietnamese revolution.

John Holdridge, the U.S. assistant secretary of state for East Asian affairs, summed up the Reagan administration's policy to an audience of American businessmen in Peking last June by saying that "we will seek . . . ways to increase the political, economic, and, yes, military pressures on Vietnam . . ." (*New York Times*, June 18, 1981).

Included in these pressures is a systematic attempt to starve out the Vietnamese by denying them desperately needed food aid.

Virtually every observer who has been in Vietnam over the past year has commented on the effects of this campaign to strangle the Vietnamese revolution. To give one of the more recent examples, *New York Times* correspondent Bernard Weinraub reported in the December 28 issue:

"Food rations in many parts of the country, especially the north, have been cut from an average of 31 pounds a month to 25.5 pounds, far below the 33 pounds considered the minimum subsistence level necessary before the onset of serious malnutrition. Fish, which used to be plentiful, is now in short supply, partly because fuel is scarce and many boats have sailed away with refugees."

Weinraub quoted the testimony of Nina McCoy, an American teacher working with a Swedish aid group. "My students sit and stare and clutch their stomachs with hunger. People are lucky if they have rice and maybe a boiled vegetable twice a day. There's no fish, no high protein, and the malnutrition among children scares me.

"I'm seeing people shrink before my eyes," she added. "It's unbearable. Whatever food people have they try to give to their kids."

'A whole generation is at stake'

Author William Shawcross, reporting on a trip to Vietnam in the September 4, 1981, *Far Eastern Economic Review*, quoted Dr. Duong Quyen Hoa, a pediatrician who found that 38 percent of the children in Ho Chi Minh City are suffering from malnutrition. And things are worse in northern and central Vietnam. "Half of the population is permanently undernourished. A whole generation of Vietnamese is at stake," Hoa told Shawcross.

According to the U.S. rulers and the U.S. big-business media, the hunger in Vietnam is the fault of the Vietnamese government. As



U.S. News & World Report put it in a November 23 article, "Vietnam's socialist economy has floundered under Hanoi's mismanagement at home and costly military adventures abroad. . . ."

A more cynical and self-serving lie would be hard to find.

The Vietnamese themselves are the first to admit that their economy has suffered from mistakes in management and bureaucratism. But these ills are hardly the root of Vietnam's economic problems.

Vietnam is one of the poorest countries in the world, with a per capita income of just \$160 per year — less even than Haiti.

Nor is there any mystery about the cause of the poverty. Vietnam was ravaged by eighty years of French colonial rule, followed by forty years of war. As a World Bank report quoted by Shawcross notes:

"In the three decades following the end of [World War II], almost every country has enjoyed substantial economic growth and an improvement in the welfare of its people . . . [But] when the war in Vietnam finally ended in 1975, per capita production of major commodities had changed little, or fallen, since the 1940s."

The report put the standard of living be-

tween those of India and Bangladesh.

Far better, from Washington's point of view, to talk about "Hanoi's mismanagement" than to recall the real record of the U.S. rulers and their responsibility for Vietnam's plight.

In the seven years from 1965 to 1971, U.S. military forces exploded 26 billion pounds (13 million tons) of munitions in Indochina — a total equivalent to the energy of 450 nuclear bombs of the type dropped on Hiroshima. This does not include the figures from 1972, which saw the heaviest bombing of the war against North Vietnam.

By the time the Pentagon was finished, South Vietnam had been hit with two and a half times the tonnage of bombs dropped worldwide from U.S. planes in all of World War II, and the North had been hit with three and a half times what all the allied powers together had dropped on Germany.

All told, 15 million Vietnamese were left homeless.

Food production had also been devastated. By 1972 there were an estimated 26 million bomb craters in South Vietnam alone. Of the 3.5 million hectares [1 hectare = 2.47 acres] of rice paddy cultivated in 1960, 1.3 million were contaminated by U.S. defoliants. An estimated 300 million pounds of explosives are still dug into the ground, waiting for the tractor of an unwary farmer or the spade of a construction worker.

Most of North Vietnam's electrical generating capacity had been destroyed, its railroad lines and highways cut in hundreds of places, its docks and port facilities badly damaged, its light industry bombed to pieces, and its cities choked with rubble.

And after all this, Vietnam was left to rebuild on its own. Washington, which had promised \$3.2 billion in reconstruction aid, never came through with one cent. The U.S. rulers even refused to provide equipment to clear buried bombs from Vietnam's fields.

But if Washington refused to aid the Vietnamese people, it also refused to leave them in peace.

Attack by Pol Pot forces

For the past four years, Vietnam has been under constant military attack. In April 1977, the genocidal Pol Pot regime in Kampuchea launched a series of raids deep into southern Vietnam, burning towns, destroying bridges and roads, and disrupting agricultural production.

The attacks continued despite continual Vietnamese appeals for a ceasefire. In February 1978, for example, the Vietnamese urged ne-

gotiations to settle the dispute and called for the establishment of a demilitarized zone along the Vietnamese-Kampuchean border. The Pol Pot regime rejected this offer.

In March and July 1978, the Vietnamese sought to negotiate a peaceful solution to the conflict through the Movement of Nonaligned Nations, but were rebuffed both times.

After more than a year and a half of repeated attacks by the Pol Pot forces, the Vietnamese army invaded Kampuchea in December 1978—January 1979, along with thousands of Kampuchean exiles who had fled the reign of terror in their homeland.

The overturn of the murderous Pol Pot regime provoked a flood of protest from Washington and its allies. Vietnam was condemned as "expansionist" and "imperialist." Australia, Japan, Britain, and others cut off their aid programs. NATO governments were unanimous in their demand that Vietnamese forces be withdrawn.

Washington's stake in Pol Pot

What was behind the sudden concern over the fate of the Pol Pot regime? Why the con-

sternation over the fall of a government responsible for the extermination of 3 million people? Washington, of course, couched its protests in terms of high-minded principles such as the rejection of the use of force in international relations, and the sanctity of international boundaries. But the Vietnamese have had some experience in how the U.S. rulers respect these principles.

Furthermore, the imperialist powers raised no such hue and cry when the Indian army helped overturn Pakistani rule in Bangladesh, or when Tanzanian troops participated in the overthrow of the Idi Amin regime in Uganda. What aroused the capitalist rulers so much in the case of Kampuchea was the issue of social revolution.

Under Pol Pot, the Kampuchean workers and peasants had been forced backward. They had been denied the social gains that they fought for in the war against the U.S.-backed dictatorship.

Instead of the masses being able to move forward in the progressive transformation of society following the defeat of the U.S.-backed regime, the workers and peasants were

confronted with a second civil war that if anything was even more brutal and destructive than the one that had just ended. The reign of terror instituted by Pol Pot and his Khmer Rouge regime was so massive that it broke the revolutionary upsurge in Kampuchea.

Unlike Vietnam after the 1975 victory, where a workers state was consolidated, in Kampuchea a reactionary capitalist regime was set up.

The imperialists had been aware of this fact for some time. Thus, the November 10, 1978, *Far Eastern Economic Review* noted the view of the Australian government that "it is essential to preserve [Kampuchea] as an independent buffer between non-communist Thailand and communist Vietnam."

But the rout of the Pol Pot forces by the Vietnamese removed this "buffer" and opened the door to the further advance of social revolution in the region. That is why the imperialists and their mouthpieces fulminate against Vietnam's "military adventures abroad" — i.e., the deliverance of the Kampuchean people from one of the most brutal regimes in hu-

War 'finally stops' for four U.S. veterans

Four U.S. veterans of the Vietnam war spent six days visiting Vietnam in December. "The war finally stopped in my mind," said Tom Bird, a former infantryman, as he flew home after the trip.

The four veterans were invited to come to Vietnam by the Vietnamese government. One official noted as the veterans arrived in Hanoi on December 18, "it was sensible to invite the veterans to come here. They were victims of the war like many of our people were victims."

This theme was repeated by Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach when he met the veterans delegation on December 22. "Tell your people that, between Vietnam and the American people, there was no victory or defeat. We were all victims," he said. "It was a war of Johnson and Nixon against the American people."

Thach's words have a particular meaning for Vietnam veterans. A 1978 U.S.-government study found that the suicide rate for soldiers who had served in Vietnam was 23 percent higher than it was for nonveterans in the same age group.

Moreover, some 2.4 million Vietnam veterans have been exposed to the lethal Agent Orange, used to defoliate forests and destroy crops during the war in Indochina. Agent Orange has been identified as the cause of various cancers, liver dysfunctions, and birth defects. The fight to get the U.S. government to help veterans who are victims of Agent Orange is still going on.

Thach said that Vietnam would welcome specialists who want to study the effects of Agent Orange, and that it would deal with the veterans' group in trying to resolve the fate of Americans missing in action.

"The Vietnamese Government will cooperate with you on the missing in action on a humanitarian basis without any conditions," he said. "We will cooperate with you, not with Reagan and the Administration. They have repaid our humanitarian activity with hostility."

Washington has repeatedly claimed that the Vietnamese have bodies of American war dead that they have not returned, and the charge has even been made that Vietnam is still holding U.S. prisoners of war.

But the Vietnamese have nothing to gain from such a course. "I get the distinct sense that the Vietnamese want to have good relations with the United States Government," said Robert Muller, executive director of the Vietnam Veterans of America. Muller, a former Marine officer who was crippled in the war, led the group of visiting veterans.

The Vietnamese, who hardly have enough fuel to run tractors and irrigation pumps, explained that they have great difficulty in sending out helicopters and search parties to hunt for the remains of U.S. soldiers in the jungles.

"It's so quiet, and the primitive level of everything here is stunning," Muller told *New York Times* reporter Bernard Wein-

raub after he had been in Hanoi for two days. "When you see this place it's almost obscene to think what we dumped on these people. There's nothing here."

Bird called the response of the Vietnamese to the veterans "incredibly warm and sensitive and friendly."

As he was leaving Ho Chi Minh City on December 24, Muller remarked: "If I said what I truly feel it would be a problem at home. As veterans, each of us have undergone a profound experience. Objectively, the trip was a success. But personally, emotionally, it's changed my view of the Vietnamese people and the reality is I've got to temper this when I get home."

Muller's misgivings about the response from the Reagan administration awaiting him and his comrades were realized soon enough. At the New York news conference held by the veterans upon their return from Vietnam, they were denounced by right-wingers egged on by the government.

State Department spokesperson Dean Fisher responded to Muller's statement that the Vietnamese had "clearly indicated a willingness" to establish diplomatic relations with the United States by saying that such relations were "out of the question" as long as Vietnamese forces were in Kampuchea and remained "a threat" to other countries in the region.

But it will take more than bluster from the State Department to erase the impact of the veterans' trip.

— D.F.

man history.

U.S. policymakers lost no time in responding to the overthrow of Pol Pot. On January 28, 1979, Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping arrived in Washington. Under the prodding of U.S. rulers, Deng declared that Vietnam ought to be "punished" and "taught some necessary lessons" because of its participation in toppling the Pol Pot regime.

On February 17, 1979, tens of thousands of Chinese troops crossed the border into Vietnam. The imperialists did not bother to hide their approval of this move. The British *Economist*, in its February 24, 1979, issue, spoke of "the positive impact of China's proven readiness to take up arms on behalf of an overrun ally," and added that success for the Chinese invasion would "make the world a slightly stabler place."

On March 4, 1979, the *New York Times* revealed that Deng had discussed the plans for the invasion of Vietnam during his trip to Washington. President Carter, of course, never bothered to inform the Vietnamese. Meanwhile, on March 1, with Chinese troops still inside Vietnam, the U.S. government went ahead with the formal opening of full diplomatic relations with Peking.

Military pressure from Peking is one aspect of the U.S.-orchestrated campaign to strangle the Vietnamese revolution. On the same day that State Department official John Holdridge gave his June 1981 speech promising to increase the pressures on Vietnam, U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig announced that Washington would sell arms to Peking.

No letup in pressure from Peking

During their 1979 invasion, Donald Wise points out in the December 25, 1981, issue of the *Far Eastern Economic Review*, "the Chinese utterly destroyed or removed all mining, industrial and other equipment or installations along a 30-mile belt south of the Sino-Vietnamese border which had been spared bombing by the US in the earlier war because of its proximity to China."

In addition to this initial destruction, the Vietnamese have had to contend with continual economic disruption in the northern provinces due to the military threat from Peking. Tran Quoc Hoan, a member of the Political Bureau of the Vietnamese Communist Party, told the Cuban magazine *Tricontinental* (no. 4, 1981) that Chinese forces "have made 3,000 armed attacks with units that range from a platoon to a regiment" since March 1979.

The Hanoi monthly *Vietnam Courier* (no. 10, 1981), reports that "where after the February-March 1979 aggression 12 points [within Vietnam] were still occupied by the Chinese side, now the number has increased to 38. Some of them lie about 1500m inside Vietnamese territory, and often are heights used as springboards for another aggression. . . ."

"Groups of Chinese scouts have been constantly sent into Vietnamese territory to conduct sabotage or reconnaissance activities. . . ."



Vietnamese troops on border with Kampuchea before overthrow of Pol Pot regime.

This kind of constant military pressure has forced the Vietnamese to maintain a huge standing army in the border region. According to the Vietnamese, there are seven army corps — twenty-eight divisions — stationed in the area between Hanoi and the northern border.

Vietnam has also been hurt by the complete cutoff of Chinese aid. Although this was always inadequate, it was still an important source of food and consumer goods.

Thai regime reactivates U.S. bases

While urging on the bureaucrats in Peking, the U.S. rulers have also been squeezing Vietnam on other fronts.

No sooner had Deng Xiaoping left Washington in February 1979 than former Thai dictator Kriangsak Chamanand was received there. "The United States has agreed to speed deliveries of tactical fighters, weapons and ammunition to Thailand," the *New York Times* reported in its February 8, 1979, issue.

Thailand, along with the other capitalist regimes in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN, which also includes Indonesia, Singapore, the Philippines, and Malaysia), has been playing a key part in Washington's campaign.

"ASEAN has quietly doubled its defense spending since the 1975 fall of South Vietnam," Arnold Brackman reported in the July 9, 1981, *Christian Science Monitor*. "Last year ASEAN spent \$5.5 billion on arms, up 46 percent from the previous year."

A recent editorial in *Vietnam Courier* (no. 11, 1981) detailed some of the steps taken by the Thai regime in October:

"Thai Premier Prem Tinsulanond went to the USA and received a pledge from the Reagan Administration to increase its arms aid in 1982 by 60% compared with 1981 and to boost

it in the future, in exchange for Thailand's commitment to let the USA reactivate the military bases of Sattahip, Korat, Ubon and Udon which they had been compelled to close in 1975 [due to mass opposition in Thailand]. After that, Thai and US troops carried out joint exercises of sea landings in the Gulf of Thailand, at the same time as the maneuvers of US-Japanese troops, of US-British-Australian-New Zealand troops, and the arms build-up at Diego Garcia base in the Indian Ocean."

U.S. warplanes return

In addition to the four bases named by *Vietnam Courier*, aircraft of the U.S. Seventh Fleet have been authorized to use the Utapao air base in Thailand, according to the December 26, 1981, issue of the Thai newspaper *The Nation*.

Utapao was one of the main U.S. bases in the air war against Vietnam. It was the only place, aside from the U.S. bases in the Philippines and Guam, that B-52 bombers operated out of. U.S. and Thai officials confirmed that the base had been reopened to U.S. planes in November.

According to Kampuchean Vice-minister for Foreign Affairs Hor Nam Hong, during 1981 there were 445 violations of Kampuchean air space by Thai planes, 6,307 incidents of artillery shelling from Thai territory, and 1,337 incursions by Thai warships into Kampuchean territorial waters. On December 28, eight Kampuchean patrol boats were killed when a Kampuchean patrol boat was sunk by Thai warships.

These incidents flow from the Thai regime's policy of support for the Khmer Rouge guerrillas. The Pol Pot forces are assured of base camps in Thailand and are supplied with arms and food through the cooperation of the Thai government. In some cases, Thai forces go

even further in aiding Pol Pot's war against the Kampuchean people.

'Enlightened rule'?

All this, of course, is done with the support and approval of the U.S. rulers. "Behind the scenes, however, the Reagan administration also appears to be weighing the possibility of supplying arms and political support to leaders trying to field resistance movements against the Vietnamese," the *Wall Street Journal* noted in a July 24, 1981 editorial.

"The central thrust of [U.S.] policy," the *Journal* editors declared, "should be to bring the tormented people of South Vietnam and Cambodia under more enlightened rule."

And what is the "enlightened" alternative being backed by Washington? None other than Pol Pot and his genocidal Khmer Rouge.

Not surprisingly, the Khmer people are having none of this. The same article in *U.S. News & World Report* that complains about Vietnamese "military adventures abroad" admits:

"Contrary to a belief held by many outsiders, most Cambodians welcome the presence of the 200,000 Vietnamese soldiers. . . ."

"The reason is 30,000 to 40,000 Khmer Rouge guerrillas in the countryside. They have vowed to regain the power wrested from them by the Vietnamese. . . ."

But surely the most despicable aspect of the imperialist campaign has been the attempt to systematically starve the Vietnamese and Kampuchean peoples into submission through a total economic blockade and the denial of desperately needed humanitarian aid.

The food weapon

"Even humanitarian aid to Vietnam today, in the wake of last year's disastrous typhoons and crop failure in the north, is frowned on as a possible contribution to the Vietnamese involvement in Cambodia," John Montagu reported in the December 3, 1981, *Los Angeles Times*. "In the United States, so much as a tractor given to Indochina as a component of disaster relief may be an offense against the Trade With the Enemy Act.

"The European Economic Community foreign ministers have also recently turned down a proposal for humanitarian aid. . . ."

"Britain's aid program in Vietnam was run down rapidly after December, 1978, when Vietnamese troops first entered Cambodia. . . ."

Kampuchea, unlike Vietnam, has been getting some humanitarian aid through the United Nations as a result of the worldwide outcry over the prospect of millions starving to death there during the famine of 1979-1980. But even this has been used as a weapon against the Kampuchean government.

Thus, as William Branigin explains in the January 19 *Washington Post*: "Southeast Asia's noncommunist nations and Western countries have insisted on separate aid for the border area to feed Cambodian followers of resistance groups battling the Vietnamese occupation forces. . . ."

"Western aid alone last year totaled \$100 million for the interior and \$88 million for the border feeding program, refugee holding centers and affected Thai villages."

In other words, almost as much aid went to the rightist guerrillas in the border areas as to "the interior" where more than 90 percent of the Kampuchean people live.

CIA disinformation campaign

The United Nations continues to extend official recognition to the Pol Pot gang as the legitimate government of Kampuchea. A UN aid program for the Thai-Kampuchean border area — i.e., for Pol Pot — has already been approved for 1982, but aid officials are dragging their feet on approving further aid to be distributed inside Kampuchea.

The pretext for this vile policy is summed up in the headline of Branigin's January 19 article: "Western Donors Fear Vietnamese Seizing Aid for Cambodians."

But field workers from virtually every religious and charitable agency that has undertaken relief projects in collaboration with the Kampuchean government give the lie to this claim.

Wall Street Journal reporter Barry Wain, for example, filed a dispatch from Phnom Penh that appeared in the December 22, 1981, issue of that big-business daily. According to Wain:

Cambodia's Heng Samrin regime, installed by the

Vietnamese in 1978, has been able to get the country almost back to normal after the famine and upheaval that followed its rise to power. . . .

International-aid workers say that in the past year the central government has overhauled provincial administration and improved the distribution of rice to needy families. . . .

Visitors from the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization were impressed to find that seed, fertilizer, equipment and food were being distributed to all the provinces they visited in October and November. "The policy of the authorities seemed to be dominated by humanitarian concepts," they wrote in a report.

The only ones cited by Wain who disagree with this assessment are "Western officials based in Bangkok." The same anonymous officials in Bangkok are also quoted by Branigin. Neither Wain nor Branigin bother to mention that Bangkok is the headquarters for the CIA destabilization campaign against Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea. No aid for the interior of Kampuchea goes through Bangkok.

The slanders against Vietnam that are being spread by the CIA, with the help of the big-business media, are particularly shameful in light of the real sacrifices made by the Vietnamese people in order to aid Kampuchea.

'Beyond the bounds of decent behavior'

In a July 3, 1981, column in the *New York Times*, Elizabeth Becker reported:

Late last year, T. Berry Brazelton, a Harvard pe-

Why 'boat people' still leave

One result of the savage campaign against the Vietnamese revolution is that some of Vietnam's 53 million people simply want to escape the economic privation and constant military threats imposed by imperialism.

Thus, in addition to the original stampede of government officials, police and army officers, and others linked to the South Vietnamese military dictatorship, and in addition to the exodus of ethnic Chinese following the nationalization of the bulk of private trade in 1978 and the worsening of relations with China, there has been a steady stream of "boat people" continuing to leave Vietnam.

In all, about 850,000 have left since 1975. This includes about 130,000 who were airlifted to the United States in 1975; some 260,000 ethnic Chinese who were resettled in China; and a total of more than 460,000 who have arrived by boat.

Washington has been encouraging the continuation of this flow of emigrants, both for propaganda reasons and as a means of hurting the Vietnamese economy. (The theft of fishing boats has severely hurt Vietnam's fishing industry, and many of those leaving are skilled workers and techni-

cians.)

As Patrick Smith reported in the July 17, 1981, issue of the *Far Eastern Economic Review*: "Enticing information is broadcast in Vietnamese four times a day by Voice of America, complemented by three daily broadcasts, also in Vietnamese, from the BBC. Beamed to Vietnam, the programmes provide information on sea conditions, on patrols by units of the US 7th Fleet and the location of rescue ships, on the relative warmth of the welcome given by various first-asylum countries and, of course, on any developments in US refugee policy — including details of the number of places available for those seeking resettlement."

From Washington's standpoint, Smith explains, "The exodus is living proof of Hanoi's inhumanity, a retrospective justification of the American attempt to save Vietnam from communism. . . . In fact the exodus proves little; if the 7th Fleet sailed into the Indian Ocean and let it be known that those reaching it would be resettled in California, the exodus from the [Indian] Subcontinent would dwarf that from Indochina."

—D.F.

diatrician, traveled to Indochina, where he discovered that the Cambodian children so recently subjected to famine were faring far better than Vietnamese children. He made the rounds of pediatric wards in both countries and found in Vietnam that "the overwhelming reason for the children's illnesses was malnutrition." He said: "The health system is good but they just don't have enough to eat."

U.S. officials responded to an emergency appeal for milk for the children of Vietnam by saying the Vietnamese should use the money spent on military operations in Kampuchea to buy milk. The European Economic Community, which cut off food shipments to Vietnam in 1979 following the entry of Vietnamese forces into Kampuchea, also refused to ship supplies of powdered milk.

As Becker noted, "The sanctions campaign has been pursued beyond the bounds of decent behavior. . . ."

American Friends Service Committee leader

James Matlack also blasted the U.S. government's "extraordinarily mean-spirited policy toward acute food shortages in Vietnam" in an August 6, 1981, article in the *Christian Science Monitor*.

"There are a number of basic points on which field workers and agencies engaged in Cambodian famine relief would agree," Matlack said. "Whatever military and security concerns led the Vietnamese to invade Cambodia, they have supplied large amounts of food and other relief aid to the Khmers despite existing shortages in Vietnam."

Matlack noted that the Kampuchean people "are nearly unanimous in welcoming the overthrow of the murderous Pol Pot regime," and pointed out that "efforts to punish Vietnam for the invasion and occupation defy the evident wishes of the Cambodian people. . . ."

Although the food situation in Kampuchea is now better than it is in Vietnam, the gains

that have been made are only a first step. The country's roads and utilities are crumbling. Bridges have collapsed; water and electrical systems are in desperate need of spare parts and new equipment; and Phnom Penh, a city of 500,000, has no sewage system.

"If nothing is done, the electricity network will collapse within six months," *Wall Street Journal* reporter Barry Wain was told in Phnom Penh. Blackouts there are already common, and the pumps in the water system depend on the supply of electricity. Meanwhile, spare parts for the U.S.-made electrical generators cannot be imported because of the imperialist embargo against trade with Kampuchea.

But the basic political fact is that for the Kampuchean people, things have gotten steadily better since the overthrow of the Pol Pot regime three years ago. "Urban and village markets are stacked with poultry, pigs, fish, fruit and vegetables," Wain reports. "General

Washington's secret war in Laos

By Harry Ring

[The following article appeared in the February 5 issue of the U.S. socialist weekly *Militant*.]

* * *

The people of Laos were victims of a massive chemical war waged against them by the U.S. government.

Previously secret documents, pried loose from the Pentagon, establish that in the mid-1960s the U.S. Air Force engaged in a wholesale spraying of Laos with Agent Orange and other poisonous herbicides. These same chemicals were also used in Vietnam.

This was while Washington was waging its war in Vietnam, and also working to thwart the victory of the independence movement in Laos.

In one seven-month period, ending in June 1966, some 200,000 gallons of deadly herbicides were dumped on the Laotian countryside.

Vietnam veterans exposed to these chemicals have made documented claims that, in addition to destroying food crops, these chemicals cause major afflictions, including liver damage, nervous disorders, birth defects in their children, and cancer.

It was as part of their effort to force the government to properly consider their claims of health damage that the National Veterans Task Force on Agent Orange went to court and obtained the present Pentagon document under the Freedom of Information Act. They were joined by a coalition of veterans, environmental, and religious groups.

The herbicidal war was initiated in Viet-

nam when the very first U.S. "advisers" were being sent in. President John Kennedy officially approved the poisonous chemical plan on November 30, 1961.

Initially, the Pentagon report discloses, then-Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara considered trying to disguise the poison spraying as an operation of the South Vietnamese dictatorship.

The January 25, 1981, *New York Times* reported that McNamara could not recall putting forward such a plan. The former war secretary assured that "many of us were environmentalists and would have been concerned" about the entire project.

The report, officially dubbed "Operation Ranch Hand," also discloses that the Pentagon smuggled the spray compounds into Vietnam in direct violation of the 1954 Geneva accords.

The United States had officially pledged to uphold the provisions of that agreement, which included creation of an International Control Commission to inspect all military equipment entering South Vietnam.

Frederick Nolting, then U.S. ambassador to South Vietnam, proposed that the deadly chemicals be shipped as "civilian cargo."

However, it was decided that a large sea shipment could not escape scrutiny, and military aircraft were used to secretly fly in 15,000 pounds of Agent Blue and 20,000 gallons of Agents Pink and Green. These are herbicides that are similar to Agent Orange.

Nolting told the *Times* he could not remember wanting to disguise the chemicals as civilian cargo.

He is currently at the University of Virgi-

nia, teaching a course on ethics in government.

Recently, Washington has been trying to promote the idea that the Soviet Union, Vietnam, and Laos are using poisonous chemicals — "yellow rain" — in Kampuchea, Afghanistan, and Laos, the principal "evidence" produced so far has been a few leaf samples from Kampuchea and Laos. The dubious circumstances under which these were obtained have created widespread skepticism among scientists regarding their authenticity.

Until 1970, Laos had been targeted by the U.S. military principally as a means of hitting at Vietnamese guerrillas who sought sanctuary there or obtained military supplies through Laos.

In 1970, U.S. bombing was sharply escalated in an attempt to block the victory of liberation forces led by the Pathet Lao. By 1973, more than 3 million tons of bombs had been dropped on this nation of 3.2 million people — one of the most savage saturation attacks in history.

In addition, some 30,000 CIA-led mercenary troops, organized in neighboring Thailand, invaded the country.

None of this worked, and by 1975 the Pathet Lao had established itself as the nation's government.

Today, Washington continues to support right-wing guerrilla forces against the Laotian government, just as it supports the ousted butcher Pol Pot against the Kampuchean government, and just as it tries to starve out Vietnam with economic weapons.

Nolting surely has a lot of material for his course on ethics in government. □

merchandise ranges from generators to motor-bikes, clothes to cameras."

The Kampuchean government allows unrestricted private trading in local foodstuffs, handicrafts and consumer goods. It has also encouraged the establishment of small shops that furnish consumer goods and services that the government is unable to provide. These shops also serve as a vital link in the chain of production — for example, through the building of boats, and farm tools, and through repair services.

Kampuchea is recovering from such absolute devastation that reestablishing even the most basic forms of economic activity makes a big difference. The problems currently facing Vietnam, however, are more complex; and in many ways the imperialist blockade is being felt far more sharply there than in Kampuchea.

Bureaucratism and corruption

The legacy of destruction left by the U.S. war machine; the imperialist blockade; the world economic crisis; the continuing military encirclement by counterrevolutionary forces; and a series of natural disasters including floods, typhoons, and droughts — all these factors have combined to create the objective obstacles that the Vietnamese must overcome.

At the same time, economic backwardness and imperialist pressures make it much harder to deal with the historical problem of bureaucratism and corruption.

A government worker who makes an average of about 100 dong a month (about \$11 at the official rate of exchange, but less than a quarter of that on the free market), must pay 27 dong for a pound of beef or pork, 17 dong for a pound of chicken, 30 dong for a cake of soap. Although many workers are able to buy food at fixed prices from the government, most simply cannot get along on their wages.

The result, a "Western observer" told the *Wall Street Journal's* Barry Wain, is "All people are obliged to have a second job, to traffic. If they don't, they starve."

"Corruption, almost everyone agrees, is as rife as it was during the war," Wain reported from Ho Chi Minh City in the January 21 *Wall Street Journal*. "No one points a finger at the leaders in Hanoi, whom one source describes as 'monks.' 'But the middle and lower levels (of the bureaucracy) are quite corrupted,' he says."

Corruption within the government and the Vietnamese Communist Party has aroused widespread anger and has been directly addressed by top leaders, such as Le Duan (see *Intercontinental Press*, May 25, 1981, p. 559).

More recently, Nayan Chanda reported in the December 4, 1981, *Far Eastern Economic Review*:

In an article published in the party daily *Nhan Dan* . . . [Vice-Premier Le Thanh] Nghi strongly criticized party members and leading cadres in the south for becoming degenerate and exploiting the peasantry as well as illegally seizing land for their own use. Nghi said that if the quality of leadership at the



U.S. bases in Thailand as of 1973. Washington is moving in again.

grassroots level is not improved, application of the product contract system [in which collective farm workers are allowed to keep surpluses above a fixed quota] "will corrode the new production relationships and even degenerate the production collectives and cooperatives which will remain in existence merely for formality's sake."

In his 1981 yearend report on the economy, Nguyen Lam, the head of Vietnam's Planning Commission, told the National Assembly that the government intends to "resolutely and heavily reduce staff, especially the state administrative staff."

Another attempt at controlling bureaucratic abuses was reported in *Vietnam Courier* (no. 4, 1981), which said, "Workers who discover cases of theft, embezzlement or waste will receive awards amounting to 10-20% of the value of the materials recovered."

Relations with minority nationalities

Bureaucratism and corruption in the state apparatus is a particularly urgent problem for the Vietnamese when it comes to relations with minority nationalities within the country. *Vietnam Courier* (no. 10, 1981), for example, reports, "Psywar methods are being tried by the Chinese side along the border: distributing leaflets, using high-power loudspeakers, with a view to spreading rumours and sowing confusion among the population in the border area. As the population there belongs to the same minorities who live on the other side of the frontier, the Chinese make use of this to bribe them, to undermine our economy and sow division among them."

Both the French colonialists and the Pentagon used the historical divisions between the various ethnic groups in Indochina as a basis for organizing counterrevolutionary armies. These forces continue to operate in parts of Thailand, Laos, and even Vietnam.

Nayan Chanda reported in the October 30, 1981, *Far Eastern Economic Review*:

How seriously the government takes its minority problems can be seen by the staging in August of the first conference of Hmong people in Ha Tuyen province bordering China. Later on, a Hmong delegation was brought to Hanoi and met Premier Pham Van Dong.

Another indication of increasing awareness by the government of the minority problem was the appointment in July of a minority leader from the Central Highlands, Y Ngong Niek Dam, to the powerful State Council and other tribal leaders Y Mot and Cam Ngoan as vice-chairmen of the National Assembly.

The government's official stance toward the minority peoples in Vietnam was presented in the report on a family planning conference that appeared in *Vietnam Courier* (no. 5, 1981). In general, the Vietnamese are trying to encourage a reduced birthrate. But Prime Minister Pham Van Dong, who spoke at the conference, stressed:

Especially in areas inhabited by small ethnic minorities where there is a need for population growth not only should we not launch a movement to reduce population growth, but we must increase our all-round support to help women to give birth and take good care of their children so that the population in these areas actually increases. This conforms with our Party and State's attitude and policy concerning the ethnic minorities of our country.

Stop the embargo!

Because of the objective circumstances facing Vietnam, the army newspaper *Quan Doi Nhan Dan* declared last September, "It is impossible . . . to avoid economic and personal difficulties. In order to overcome these difficulties, there is no alternative other than to demand extraordinary efforts of our entire party, people and army" (*Far Eastern Economic Review*, October 30, 1981).

Due to shortages of fuel, spare parts, and raw materials, planning chief Nguyen Lam reported in his December 1981 review of the economy, "The output of many essential consumer goods such as cloth, fabric, paper, rush mats, bicycle accessories and medicine decreased."

However, thanks to favorable weather and a new system of economic incentives to farmers, Vietnam reaped a record 15-million-ton harvest, according to Lam. The success was achieved despite the fact that the country's lack of foreign exchange reserves made it impossible to import as much fertilizer, pesticides, tractor fuel, and other supplies as was needed.

The record 1981 harvest has coincided with some gains for Vietnam on other fronts. Diplomatic ties with Sweden have been improving,

and some aid has come from that quarter. In addition, in December the French government agreed to provide Vietnam with \$35 million in aid.

Nevertheless, the blockade continues. Last November, the World Food Program refused, under U.S. pressure, to grant \$5 million worth of credits for the construction of a canal irrigation system.

It is necessary to demand an end to the shameful use of food as a weapon against the peoples of Indochina.

It is necessary to call a halt to the criminal policy of arming the Thai military dictatorship and the rightist forces of Pol Pot against the peoples of Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea.

It is necessary to rally world opinion against the denial of aid to Vietnam. The U.S. refusal

to provide the \$3.2 billion it promised for reconstruction in Vietnam is especially glaring in light of the hundreds of millions of dollars Washington is pouring into El Salvador to back up the murderous junta there.

The Vietnamese people have struggled against overwhelming odds for the past forty years simply for the right to control their own country and to build a better society.

They have given and continue to give an almost superhuman example of courage, self-sacrifice, and revolutionary determination.

With the solidarity of working people throughout the world, the Vietnamese people will win against the most recent attempts to strangle their revolution, just as they won against the French colonial empire and the war of genocide waged by Washington. □

Kampuchea

'We know that the future is ours'

Interview with leader of Front for National Salvation

[The following interview was granted to *Intercontinental Press* in Havana by Hor Nam Hong, a member of the Central Committee of the Kampuchea National United Front for National Salvation. Hor was a delegate from the People's Republic of Kampuchea to the International Seminar in Solidarity with the Peoples of Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea, held November 19-21, 1981, in Havana.]

* * *

Question. What is the current stage of the reconstruction effort in Kampuchea?

Answer. You know that after we liberated the country in 1979 everything had been destroyed by the barbarous regime of Pol Pot and Ieng Sary. All foreign visitors that have been in our country have been able to observe this. And all visitors who have been in our country have been able to witness for themselves that the reality they see in our country is totally different from the information that they had received.

When we liberated our country Phnom Penh was not a city. It was not a capital — it was a ghost town. Houses were destroyed, the streets were full of debris — air conditioners, typewriters, chairs, tables — everything was thrown in the streets. Because Pol Pot considered all of these things symbols of capitalism.

Three million citizens were massacred. Almost all of our intellectuals were killed. Before the arrival of Pol Pot there were approximately 500 physicians. In 1979, after the liberation, there were less than 50. This is just an example. This goes for all the other fields of knowledge. No hospitals, no schools, no markets. Everybody was rounded up in concentration camps. And they were forced to work fourteen or fifteen hours a day, with nothing to eat.

Some of the people killed during the Pol Pot regime were killed deliberately, others were starved, still others died from disease without medical aid.

This is why we still feel the suffering imposed by this regime.

Although we have had to face many difficulties, we know that the future is ours. Life is becoming more normal, it is becoming consolidated in all fields.

On the political front, we have had general elections. We have a constitution, an assembly democratically elected by the people — all our institutions have been elected democratically. Even local administrations have been elected by the people.

From the military point of view, security in Phnom Penh and in different cities of the country is better than in some cities in other countries of Southeast Asia. No incidents have been provoked by the enemy. This does not mean that they will not try again, but they will not be able to succeed.

The troops of Pol Pot and other reactionary forces, you should know, are posted on the border between Kampuchea and Thailand. When we defeated them, they took that territory, and they have taken refuge in Thai territory. The armed forces of Thailand protect these people. They have violated our territorial integrity — by means of planes, cannon shot, and boats as well.

Without this complicity, this haven in Thailand, and the weapons supplied by the Chinese, this force would not be able to exist. It would have been liquidated. That is why we call this the Chinese threat. Everybody in Bangkok knows that these forces survive only thanks to the massive aid and the support of the Chinese.

Q. As you know, the capitalist news media in the United States, along with the Reagan administration, continue to demand the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea, and claim that your government is not a legitimate one. What do you say in answer to this?

A. Those who say that they love our people and yet wish to place obstacles in the way of our people's independence and sovereignty, those who speak against Vietnamese aid and who wish that the Vietnamese troops would withdraw, those who say they want our people to have general elections under United Nations control — they do not know the real nature of the Pol Pot regime.

It is we who have suffered, we who know the nature of this regime. Those who say all these things, those who wish Pol Pot to return, are just serving politics, the politics of Chinese expansionism and U.S. imperialism.

This is why they now wish to use the name of Sihanouk or Son Sann in order to mask the fact that they are still advancing Pol Pot's line.

You have to realize that this is a Chinese maneuver. Domestically they try to use the forces of Pol Pot and foster the forces of Pol Pot, but they seek a name that is not so identified with the crimes of Pol Pot, and they try to use these two elements. They use the names of Sihanouk and Son Sann to try to cover up the activities of Pol Pot.

Q. How do you see the relationship between Kampuchea and the Cuban revolution?

A. Cuba is a brother in arms. We have always been on the same side against the same enemies. We have always fought together. Although we are far apart geographically speaking, we have always taken the same stand.

Cuba's solidarity for us is very important. Cuba has always given us aid and support for the struggle against imperialist aggression, and it still supports us. Cuba supplies us with efficient support, even now in our struggle against the imperialists and Chinese expansionism. □

British jobless top 3 million

The official total of jobless workers in Britain passed the 3 million mark in the last week of January, the largest number in British history. With 3,070,621 out of work, the unemployment rate was 12.7 percent.

While the absolute number of jobless in Britain is the highest of any European country, the unemployment rate in Belgium and Spain — 14.6 percent and 13.6 percent respectively — surpasses the British rate.

In fact, high unemployment is plaguing virtually all the imperialist countries. In France and Italy the unemployment rate is about 10 percent. In West Germany the number of jobless has doubled in the past year to 7 percent of the workforce. In the United States the official rate stands at 8.9 percent, and is also rising.

Polish union activists organize resistance

'There is no way to destroy the solidarity among people'

[Following the December 13, 1981, declaration of a state of war in Poland, the activities of the Solidarity union movement were formally suspended by the government. Union activists, however, soon began to organize new workers committees. They have published numerous uncensored leaflets, bulletins, and statements that are being circulated throughout the country.

[We are reprinting below a selection of these documents. They have been taken from the New York Polish-language daily *Nowy Dziennik*, which obtained them from the Solidarity Support Committee in New York. The translations are by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

The following statement, signed by the Małopolska regional chapter of Solidarity, was issued by the union's information bureau in Rzym.

Acts of antiunion repression are continuing, increasing, and broadening out. In Krakow, some 150 people have been interned and several hundred arrested. It is difficult to accurately keep track of those detained and then released. Union activists are beginning to be fired from their jobs on a large scale. For example, in the state administrative offices and courts they are being dismissed when they refuse to sign declarations resigning from Solidarity. Massive pressure is being put on employees to sign loyalty oaths.

The union declares that it will defend its members through all the means at its disposal. Support for those imprisoned and interned is already being organized. This includes legal assistance, food and material aid, and medical help for the prisoners and their families. Each family already has or is receiving individual care. The greatest problem is finding all the prisoners and their families — which must be done unofficially since the military government has not to this day made public a list of the prisoners, nor even officially informed their families. Because of this, support for the prisoners requires that you:

First, send all news about the fate of the prisoners as well as the addresses of their families to the Madame Curie Charity Division on Franciszkanski Street.

Second, in your own factory organize aid for imprisoned workmates and their families and inform the Madame Curie Charity about the extent of this aid as soon as possible.

Third, organize within the factory a systematic collection of money for prisoners and those dismissed from work. If more money is collected in one factory than is required there, it can be used elsewhere. Monthly collections

— in addition to the collections for the union — will solve all the problems of financial aid. For the time being, these funds should be collected on your own and delivered to the Madame Curie Charity Division.

In the same way, it is vital to take care of those who have lost their jobs or are yet to lose them because of antiunion repression. Evidence must be gathered about such cases and, besides aiding these people, direct contacts must be maintained with them. When circumstances permit, the union will take responsibility for them and demand compensation and reinstatement in their jobs.

In enterprises where the workers are not sufficiently organized to resist signing declarations of resignation from Solidarity, the regional leadership advises that you collectively sign such declarations so that the most self-sacrificing union members are not exposed to losing their jobs or contact with their fellow workers. It is not important if we sign as long as we remain active. From the legal point of view, all declarations made under duress have no significance; these actions have an exclusively psychological aim, to intimidate and expose those who are the most committed and to break up groups of workers.

On the other hand, we must remember that we can win nothing from these authorities through docility — they respect only strength. We should put considerable pressure on them to obtain the most we can as a workforce and union organization.

Let us not deceive ourselves: the night of December 13 marked the latest attempt to restore the reality that was done away with in October 1956.¹ Passivity will not improve our lot; it can only aid those who hatch plots against the nation. The key question is preserving and strengthening the unity and dignity of working people, and rather than driving away those who were formerly against Solidarity, we should draw them nearer to us, since only the struggle of our nation can open their eyes.

The most important task is to adequately protect our leading cadres, people who, to their greatest ability, are striving to defend the factories from the madness of the Security Service, party apparatus, and military commissars. Employees should form a protective circle around factory leaders who remain thrown out of their jobs by the military government for not carrying out its orders diligently enough.

1. In October 1956, Wladyslaw Gomułka came to power in Poland with popular support and against the opposition of the Kremlin, which threatened to invade Poland. Repressive policies were eased under the new government due to mass pressure.

The union will take care of these people when our time comes. And it will certainly come, for there is no way to destroy the solidarity among the people.

As during the time of the Nazi occupation, it is necessary for everyone to find ways to fight against informers and collaborators. The names and actions of these people should be disseminated as widely as possible. We will do nothing to harm them, but at the same time there is no place for them among decent people, and their families and friends should learn what kind of people they are dealing with. There can be no place for such people in our union.

Finally, it is vital to maintain factory records and note down people's behavior and everything important that goes on. This is something that is easily forgotten, but someday it will be necessary to go back to these records.

* * *

The following appeal, entitled, "Basic principles of the resistance movement," was issued by the Solidarity information services in the southern industrial cities of Katowice and Rybnik.

The coup d'état has presented Solidarity members with a dramatic choice. Resistance or capitulation? For those who courageously choose opposition and will participate in the Solidarity Resistance Union, there is some practical advice. The present terror is a version of total Stalinist terror that our generation has not faced before. The new situation therefore throws up new rules of the game, which must be learned — and as quickly as possible. Here are some of the principles of resistance:

1. In the event of a strike or other protest action, remain among the workers.

2. Do not form any strike committees. Protect the leaders and organizers. The basic principle at the time of action: the whole factory strikes, there are no leaders.

3. In contacts with the police and army, *you are uninformed, you know nothing, and you have heard nothing.*

4. In each workplace, Solidarity members must be present *physically* (they should not let themselves be eliminated through mindless bravado) and *morally* (Solidarity members should clearly let the workers know that we have not run away and that we are together with them).

5. Do not take things out on the person next to you. Your enemy is *the policeman, the zealous employee, the informer.*

6. Work slowly, grumble about the mess and the incompetence of the supervisors. Refer

decisions to the commissars and collaborators. Bombard them with questions and doubts. Do not think for yourselves. Play the idiot. Do not go beyond the decisions of the commissars and collaborators through a servile attitude. They must carry out their own dirty work. In this way create a void around them, and swamp them with even the smallest problems to begin to break down the police and military machine.

7. Follow to the letter the most idiotic instructions. Do not solve problems; leave that to the commissars and collaborators. Stupid rules are your ally. At the same time, remember to constantly help out your workmates and neighbors without bothering about the rules.

8. If you are ordered to break or go around the rules, demand the decision in writing. Make a fuss. Drag the whole game out. Sooner or later the commissar will want to have some peace. *That will be the beginning of the end of the dictatorship.*

9. As often as possible, take time off for illness or to care for your children.

10. Avoid all friendly contacts with collaborators, zealous employees, commissars, and the like.

11. Help in every way the families of those arrested, injured, or killed.

12. Set up social aid funds and collect contributions.

13. Participate actively in word-of-mouth propaganda, passing on information about the situation in the country or examples of resistance.

14. Paint slogans, put up posters and leaflets. Distribute independent publications — *but take all necessary precautions.*

15. In organizational activities, follow the old principle of underground work: *I know only what I need to know.* Remember: There is no more important task today than to fight for the freedom of those arrested, an end to the state of war, and the restoration of civic and union liberties. We will win!

* * *

The following statement was issued in Krakow on January 4. It was signed by the Malopolska regional chapter of Solidarity.

The mass media is already transmitting proclamations that Solidarity, among other things, is preparing to form terrorist groups to fight against the people's state; this is a new and dangerous propaganda note, flowing logically from the claims about Solidarity's "bloody coup attempt."

The Malopolska regional leadership warns union members, youth, and all people of good will against terrorist attempts provoked by the Security Service. Beware of people who try to put such ideas into your heads and make their names public.

Terrorism is a nineteenth-century invention of the tsarist Okhrana [secret police] and in a totalitarian state it serves only to consolidate the government by isolating it from society and by strengthening the self-protective and aggressive stance of functionaries in the army,

police, and state apparatus.

Terrorism also serves to compromise one in the eyes of society and gives the authorities a legal basis to repress all social and opposition movements.

Based on fabrications about terrorism, the authorities may attempt — through their own terrorist actions — to eliminate some Solidarity activists.

The Malopolska regional leadership declares: We condemn terrorism as a method of action that is in contradiction with our Christian ethics and with the program and basis of activity of Solidarity as a trade union and social movement, as well as a method that is ineffective and counterproductive. Involvement in terrorist activities signifies automatic resignation from membership in Solidarity.

The above position, which was considered a matter of urgency, was not coordinated with other regions, but we have no doubt that it is the collective position of the entire union — because it flows straight from our program.

We will not win by using evil against evil — only through good can we win!

* * *

The following letter, addressed "to all Solidarity activists," was signed by Zbigniew Janas, the chairman of the Solidarity chapter at the large Ursus tractor factory outside Warsaw and a member of the union's National Committee (KK).

From the available information about the activities of the police and the Security Service and from the stepped-up propaganda against Solidarity members, we can conclude that the military regime is aiming to smash Solidarity and paralyze society.

In keeping with our analysis, the authorities will try with all their might to improve the food situation, even by imposing a compulsory levy on farmers. This must lead to a total catastrophe in food supplies over the long run, if, as the experience of the Gierek and Jaroszewicz government proved,² the regime does not refrain from arbitrary decisions to achieve a basic minimum, even if that worsens the catastrophic debt.

Because the present government can no longer resort to such methods, it will try to increase crop purchases from farmers by means of compulsion. This cannot lead to any positive results. The entire history of the Polish People's Republic testifies to that.

From the decisions that have already been made, we can see that the junta will try to achieve stabilization through the direct blocking of the amount of money that can be exchanged.³ This can only lead to extreme poverty for many families who today already live in severe want. Such measures can provoke spon-

2. The government of Edward Gierek and Piotr Jaroszewicz, which ruled throughout most of the 1970s until Gierek was deposed following the July-August 1980 strikes, has become notorious for its extreme economic mismanagement, including the building up of a large foreign debt.

taneous rebellions, possibly leading to bloodshed, as the example of Silesia shows.⁴

The feeble reaction of the Western countries to the events in Poland shows that Poles can only count on themselves; they must themselves organize to defend human, civil, and trade-union rights. The only force on which we can rely in this difficult period is the Catholic church. It is therefore necessary to collaborate closely with the church, especially in organizing solidarity and support for people arrested, dismissed from work, in hiding, and for all those who are in some way persecuted. In the near future we can foresee no significant change in the attitude of the West, which has not undertaken any decisive political or economic action.

What are the conclusions of this brief analysis? What activities should Solidarity members undertake?

1. It is necessary for representatives of our union to link up and collaborate with each other, both within each factory unit and among different workforces. To achieve this and to coordinate activities, it is vital to improve the flow of information. This will also serve to relay the experiences of the union. It is necessary to achieve collaboration between those in the factories and those outside, and with this aim to organize meetings in private homes outside of working hours.

2. It is indispensable to organize broad material and moral support for the families of those arrested and persecuted. This must be carried out in a regular and ongoing way. Therefore, it is necessary to organize collections of money from friends in the work brigades and union groups. It must be remembered that such activities arouse solidarity among people and make the deprivation of anyone impossible. These actions must be undertaken immediately, considering the weight of their moral influence over people.

3. It is necessary to establish contacts with underground publishing houses with the aim of distributing leaflets and all other unofficial publications. This activity is enormously important in light of the complete propaganda broadcast by the mass media, which lies, slanders, and distorts the facts on the basis of Goebbel's maxim that a lie repeated a hundred times becomes the truth. This activity must be carried out in great secrecy, considering the heavy security and dangerous consequences. But do not lightly give up these activities without considering the security threat.

4. Strictly union activities must also be un-

3. One of the military council's first acts after declaring martial law was to freeze withdrawals by Poles from foreign currency bank accounts. This made it impossible for them to buy many of the scarce consumer goods that were still available in the so-called dollar shops, which accept only hard currency from the West.

4. On December 16, seven striking miners were shot to death by riot police at the Wujek coal mine near Katowice. Another later died in the hospital.

dertaken. The elimination of all rights and the increase in the number of reprisals by management representatives and party activists makes it necessary to oppose such actions with all our strength, and to gather the names of those who have attempted to carry out these types of actions. With this aim, files relating to illegal and antipeople activities of the party and administrative apparatus must be established. These files should be decentralized so that the loss of one does not lead to the loss of all of them. To the extent that it is possible, it is vital to print illegal documents and distribute them among the workforce.

In this difficult period, these activities must not be left to the future: the raising of labor concepts on production matters, the establishment of new collective arrangements, and the carrying out of other legal activities that help workers, such as those concerning safety and

health conditions. This is important so that the authorities themselves do not imagine that our powerful organization can be destroyed by one or a few blows.

5. Written protests must be made, both individually and collectively, condemning the actions of the military junta and demanding freedom for arrested union activists and the restoration of society's independent rights. These letters should be legibly signed, since only then will they have propaganda and moral value.

6. In anticipation of a social explosion, it is necessary to prepare for the proclamation of a general strike. These preparations must be carried out in great secrecy. With this aim, clandestine committees must be set up, which should undertake the organizational preparations. They must not, however, carry out active resistance, since that could lead to

bloodshed. In this country, the government, which claims to rest on the workers, has already spilled much workers' blood. Remember that they are murderers. It does not matter to them how many people are shot down if it serves their interests.

To conclude, I remind all activists that they were chosen through democratic elections for two-year terms. They were given this approval, and nothing but nothing can prevent them from fulfilling their role of serving those who elected them.

Remember: we cannot defend ourselves through ignorance or fear. Each of us must calculate what they can do when it is possible, but also what to do when it is necessary to risk their jobs or even their freedom. In these difficult days we must all prevent the destruction of Solidarity, which is the only hope of Poles.

For us, the sun will shine once again. □

STATEMENT OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Imperialist remilitarization and the struggle against austerity, for peace and socialism

[The following resolution was passed by majority vote of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International in October 1981.]

* * *

Since Reagan's election the rearmament campaign of imperialism initiated by Washington has taken on gigantic proportions. It is combined with the capitalists' general austerity offensive against working people. These are the responses that North American imperialism, its Japanese, and above all its Western European allies mean to give to the crisis of capitalism and the continuing revolutionary processes, especially in the semicolonial countries. By favoring a reinforcement, reorganization, and redeployment of its military resources, imperialism wants to try to stop the erosion of its positions, launch new attacks against working people, and prepare, in the long term, the reconquest of those parts of the world it has lost. Within this framework the North American citadel is playing the main role. It was on its initiative that the arms race had been relaunched on an enlarged basis in 1978-79 under the presidency of Carter, which reached a first peak with the NATO decisions of November 12, 1979, which envisaged the deployment of the second-generation Pershing and Cruise missiles. Reagan's decision to put the neutron bomb into production marks a new and very serious acceleration of imperialist war preparations. Without underestimating the importance of the redeployment of conventional military resources, it is undoubtedly the accumulation of new nuclear arms stocks that

represents the principal danger.

After having mounted an intensive propaganda campaign on the supposed superiority of Soviet military potential, particularly the medium-range nuclear arsenal (SS-20), Washington adjusted its military language to its warmongering aims. Firstly, by the adoption of an "antiforce" strategy, which aims to destroy the military and economic potential of the enemy, as opposed to an "anti-city" strategy of destroying the urban centers. Secondly, by replacing the search for "approximate parity" current under Nixon and Carter with the concept of looking for "a margin of security."

Nuclear war not inevitable

Faced with the eventuality of a nuclear war, which according to all probabilities would result in a general holocaust, the strategic aim of the world workers movement cannot be a "conjunctural" victory in an atomic war. To build communism, humanity must exist. The aim must therefore be to prevent nuclear war. Such a war is not inevitable. But it would be illusory to expect a solution of true disarmament from a negotiated process; for as long as capitalism survives the risks of war will remain. The realistic alternative is to disarm imperialism by overturning it in its main strongholds. In the last analysis, only the victory of the proletariat in the most developed imperialist countries, in particular the victory of the American proletariat, can definitively save humanity from the nightmare of nuclear annihilation.

The Fourth International has always counterposed the revolutionary solution to the utopian illusions of "peaceful coexistence" or

"victory" in a nuclear world war. This is why it attaches particular importance to the mass antiwar mobilizations that are gaining ground in the whole of capitalist Europe, North America, and Japan. These mobilizations are even more decisive, since everything indicates that we are not in the final phase preceding the outbreak of a third world war. The principal political and social preconditions for triggering a cataclysm of this significance do not at all exist. The proletariat in the West has not suffered a decisive defeat. The working masses of these countries are neither demoralized nor incapable of acting. They would not tolerate the insanity of collective nuclear suicide organized by their ruling classes.

People who talk about the inevitability of a third world war frivolously underestimate what is at stake for the whole of humanity; and, in a no less irresponsible way, they consider that a vital battle for the world proletariat has already been lost, even before the struggle has been really engaged. The Fourth International's objective in participating in the antiwar movement and in stimulating it, is to increase the anti-imperialist and anticapitalist consciousness of the masses, strengthen their increasingly broad capacity of mobilization, and to score the first victories, in order to facilitate a generalized victorious assault against bourgeois state power. Only the disarmament of capitalism and the overthrow of its state power will once and for all put an end to the threat of war.

Imperialism's rearmament campaign

The new course of American policy, which has been unambiguously affirmed since Rea-

gan's election, is evidence of the resolution of the U.S. leaders to reestablish the political, military, and economic superiority of the principal imperialist power. This political resolution amplifies the tendency to the growing militarization of the crisis-ridden capitalist economy, characterized by the diversion of research towards military ends, by an unprecedented growth in military spending, and by a considerable extension of commercial transactions relating to military material. Certain neutralist currents, while understanding this tendency of the capitalist economy to transform itself into a gigantic military-industrial complex, underestimate the political will that is part and parcel of it, and therefore only partially grasp the meaning of the capitalist's remilitarization effort. It is really a question of the global reorientation of U.S. imperialism and its allies to confront developments in the economic crisis and in the anti-imperialist and class struggle. This is a reorientation that tends to break with a period (1975-79) of partial paralysis on the international level for the United States, which recovered with difficulty from the "Vietnam syndrome."

The key leaders in Washington, aware of the repercussions of the insurrectionary overthrow of the dictatorships of the shah in the Middle East and Somoza in Central America, drew an obvious conclusion: any revolutionary breakthrough, including the colonial revolution, directly threatens their "vital interests." The result of this is a "globalization" of the defense of imperialist interests, which is the basis of the interventionist course of action that Washington intends once again to follow. It is with this objective that the U.S. military apparatus is in the process of being reorganized in order to take on armed interventions of all types and dimensions anywhere on the globe. Within this framework, the perspective of eventually firing nuclear weapons is outlined. This explains the decision to start production of the neutron bomb, which is not a new weapon, but has never been deployed because its use did not figure in the scenarios of the general-staffs of the counterrevolution.

Today it is quite a different story, with the concrete content NATO strategists give to the doctrine of "flexible response" based on a willingness to adapt possible responses to all types of possible threats. In fact within this framework they envisage what they call both "vertical" and "horizontal" escalation. By "vertical" escalation, they reveal their determination to add another rung to the ladder of escalation of terror. The neutron bomb, for instance, tends to reduce the qualitative difference of the passage from the "classical" arsenal to firing tactical nuclear weapons through the reduction of material destruction caused by the bomb, but not the number killed. By "horizontal" escalation, they envisage displacing the zone of a limited conflict towards other zones, based in advance on a terrorist policy of reprisals. In this way they are endeavoring to avoid getting automatically caught up in "an escalation to extremes" (the use of the intercontinental nu-

clear strategic arsenal), while making possible the recourse to short- and medium-range nuclear arsenals.

Neutronic charges, the product of a growing miniaturization of nuclear munitions, coupled with technological innovations in the use of vectors (penetration, accuracy against the target, hardening up and independent guiding of the multiple heads of the same warhead cone) — all these characteristics of the new generation of nuclear arms systems contribute to making the possible use of the atom to maintain "imperialist order" a dangerous reality.

After SALT agreements, a more direct confrontation with USSR

This turn in American policy affects global East-West relations just as much as inter-imperialist relations and the way that imperialism reacts to developments in the colonial revolution.

The previous decade of East-West relations had been marked by the SALT process — negotiations concerned with the limitation of strategic nuclear arms. Inaugurated in 1968, this process continued up to the signing of the second agreement in 1979, which the U.S. Senate refused to ratify. The SALT talks in no way represented a progression towards disarmament. The astronomic ceilings fixed at each stage, far from putting a brake on the arms race, has in fact relaunched it. This is less from a quantitative point of view, it is true, than a qualitative one, which is where American imperialism excels, given its technological lead.

Both imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy, in fact, periodically need a certain degree of control over the escalation of the arms race, since it imposes a heavier and heavier burden on the economy, especially for the Soviet Union, whose productive power is still substantially less than that of American capitalism.

In this sense SALT represented a negative factor just before imperialism's present campaign of rearmament. At one and the same time, it permitted Washington to work as it pleased on the development of more and more sophisticated arms, while spreading the illusion among the masses that a lasting peace could result from an agreement between the two main nuclear powers, guaranteed by the "equilibrium of terror" and a peaceful confrontation in the arms race. U.S. imperialism placed its policy towards Moscow in this framework because it judged that the common defense of the world status quo conformed to the defense of its essential interests. But recognizing the impossibility of heading off new revolutionary developments purely through bloc-to-bloc relations and opting for a global strategy of counteroffensive, it aims to subordinate the pursuit of bilateral negotiations to its rearmament effort. It committed itself from then on to the perspective of a more direct confrontation with the USSR, aiming to make it pay an exorbitant economic price for following the military program it has committed itself to. In addition Washington intends to "cover up"

in advance its counterrevolutionary deeds by the return to a certain cold war atmosphere, which is supposed to allow it to carry out its crimes at the smallest political and social cost in the imperialist centers.

Nevertheless the opening of negotiations on the control of the nuclear arms race between Moscow and Washington always remains possible. The bureaucracy is a ready applicant. Imperialism, based on its conjunctural interests, even if only to assuage the feelings of its allies, can in fact accept this in principle. However it is probable that this will not be a determining feature of American policy towards Moscow in the immediate period.

The programs underway or in study with regard to the intercontinental nuclear arsenal (new strategic bomber, underground or airport MX bases, arming submarines with Trident II, etc.) will not be affected. These programs, which represent the main motor of the arms race due to the heavy investment involved, are going to further accentuate the superiority of U.S. military potential in the strategic arms sector.

Arms buildup in Europe

The decision of NATO in 1979 to install 108 Pershing II and 464 Cruise missiles in Europe between now and 1983 does not open up a perspective of direct or indirect disengagement of U.S. imperialism from Europe. The latter is too vital to U.S. imperialism. The hypothesis of a nuclear war in the European theater without either side using its strategic arsenals, is too illusory for the U.S. to envisage even an indirect disengagement. Finally, U.S. imperialism would not be able to carry out a nuclear war limited to Europe while "reasonably" hoping its territory would remain outside the battlefield, because it is protected by an intercontinental arsenal whose triggering would be synonymous with a general holocaust. We have to conclude that those who speak in such a way have motives other than those they invoke.

For some it is a case above all of putting pressure on the European bourgeoisies so that they participate more significantly in the rearmament decreed by Washington. For others it is a case of justifying their desire to see the birth of an "independent" imperialist Europe equipped with nuclear or conventional defense systems. In both cases the direct consequence of these types of political positions is the reinforcement of the military potential of the bourgeois armies.

In reality American imperialism, through the combination of its central strategic arsenal and its arsenal in the European theater (which would result from the installation of middle-range weapons), demonstrates that it does not have the objective of a nuclear war limited to Europe.

Its policy has its roots in the very logic of the development of a capitalist arms economy, which must profitably use its technological innovations. At this stage there is a close relationship between the various programs it is

carrying out within the intercontinental or European arsenals. With the decision to deploy these arms, the objectives of the American leaders only become more clear:

A. In the framework of East-West relations, Washington discounts reinforcing its territory as a "sanctuary," banking realistically on the impossibility for the Soviet economy to compete in all domains in the arms race (strategic, tactical, eurostrategic, and classical arms). Imperialism can only take advantage of an undeniable superiority in the essential sectors in order to obtain substantial political concessions from the bureaucracy.

B. In the framework of interimperialist relations, the installation of euromissiles can only accentuate even more the political dependence of the European bourgeoisies on Washington. The former, with the exception only of France and to a lesser extent West Germany, are obliged to be clients of Washington as regards military matériel. They will pay a good part of the bill for these new arms, whose operation will remain entirely at the discretion of the United States. It is therefore also a good means for U.S. imperialism to reinforce its military leadership with less expense. On this basis we can expect a new and more vigorous offensive of Washington towards the European bourgeoisies to get them to respect their 1977 commitment, renewed in 1979, to increase their military spending by at least 3 percent a year.

New interimperialist contradictions are appearing inside the counterrevolutionary North Atlantic alliance, despite the success that the effective return of Greece and the probable entry of Spain into NATO represent for imperialism. These contradictions are the result of a combination of several factors: the central role of NATO as a military bloc for all that directly concerns East-West relations; the willingness of Washington to carry out, parallel to NATO, unilateral actions as a function of its dominant position. The different level of the class struggle on opposite sides of the Atlantic does not permit the homogenization of the military policies of the different imperialist powers, whatever may be the proclaimed intentions, as the question of military budgets illustrates.

Imperialist war preparations cannot be reduced to Reagan's policies. The European capitalist governments take their full place too.

In the field of nuclear arsenals France already possesses a strategic and tactical strike force and envisages equipping itself with neutron weapons. It occupies a first-class seat in the present rearmament campaign. Britain is also reinforcing its nuclear arsenal.

As regards conventional military resources, Paris and Bonn have considerable means at their disposal, including for intervention outside the European theater in the Gulf, Mediterranean, or in Africa — resources which are being rapidly developed.

Finally their respective places in the top league of arms-exporting countries testifies to a growing militarization of their economies. For France this reaches a point of exceptional hypertrophy if one considers its arms produc-

tion sector in relation to the rest of its economic and industrial potential. Mitterrand's election will not modify this tendency; under certain conditions it can deepen it even further.

In the Gulf, Central America, and throughout the world

To the extent that its change of course is the direct consequence of the defeats inflicted on it by the rise of the colonial revolution — mainly in the Middle East with the loss of the Iranian stronghold and in Central America with the fall of Somoza — North American imperialism deploys its forces to hold back any new revolutionary progress in this sector. First of all there was the setting up of the external intervention force in 1979 under Carter's administration. This is the reason for Reagan's decision to reorganize the general staff of this force to bring it up to the rank of one of the four big command staffs of the U.S. military apparatus. This is also the justification for getting a program of naval re-equipment underway which should bring the U.S. Navy up from some 450 units to 600 combat ships.

The combination of these elements, Rapid Deployment Force and naval superiority, indicates that imperialism has drawn the lessons of its recent setbacks. While massively arming a series of dictatorships as "relays" for its domination in every corner of the world, it knows that these regimes do not offer it sufficient guarantees for a counterrevolutionary intervention of sufficient breadth and duration. This is why Washington is equipping itself with the broadest possible conventional means to maintain imperialist order. Not only is U.S. imperialism not allowing the extension of new revolutions without a military response, but it is also looking to directly and massively intervene because it does not have confidence in its auxiliary "policemen." This is the clear conclusion based on the redeployment of its military apparatus to build a network across the globe with the greatest possible number of naval and land support bases.

It would however be dangerous to see counterrevolutionary imperialist intervention in this or that region of the world against new developments of the colonial revolution only in terms of conventional arms. In fact the neutron bomb, due to its characteristics which permit relative control of the nuclear explosion, could be used for antisubversive purposes — that is, against a mass uprising.

It would certainly not be used in the first phase of an intervention, where classical methods are generally more appropriate; but to exclude a priori such a possibility would be to seriously underestimate the criminal cynicism of Washington. U.S. imperialism used the "lowest cost" argument to justify the 1945 atomic bombs. It does not argue differently today, particularly since the neutron bomb offers it new possibilities. Washington can also count on the "support bases" of European, and even Japanese imperialism in the years to come to aid its effort to maintain imperialist order — particularly in Africa where France has strong

positions. Washington will also rely on a certain number of countries on the "periphery" who are equipped with considerable military resources and an already significant arms industry. This is especially the case for Israel, Brazil, Argentina, and South Africa.

In this framework we have seen a permanent and systematic military network set up in the Gulf and Middle East area because it is decisive for the supplies of oil products for the whole capitalist economy. Here the American imperialists are backed up mainly by French and English imperialism, and secondarily by German and Japanese imperialism.

This is the situation because the lesson the imperialists' chiefs of staff have drawn as a result of the fall of the Pahlavi dynasty in Tehran is that the hypothesis of a "raid" — necessarily limited to the oilfields of the Middle East — would not be sufficient to dam up revolutionary developments in the region. It was the "raid" hypothesis that was the basis in 1979 of the setting up of the Rapid Deployment Force — an American and a French one was formed. Since then imperialism has completed its preventive defense systems, notably with the permanent stationing of a good part of the West's naval forces in the Indian Ocean close to the Gulf. At the same time, aid in overarming the "client" countries of imperialism in the region has increased to very large proportions as demonstrated by the extremely significant case of Saudi Arabia. Reagan has delivered several AWACS, while France is supplying it with considerable army and naval military resources. In this region, in addition to Saudi Arabia, imperialism has its main strongholds in Egypt and Israel. Furthermore the missiles to be stationed in Sicily turn this Mediterranean island into a bulwark against the Arab revolution.

In the Far East, the counterrevolutionary network is based on three poles: Japan, which in turn has committed itself to a considerable arms program; the Philippines, notably with the U.S. Subic and Clark bases; and South Korea.

In Africa the specific role devolved to South Africa is complemented by a significant presence of imperialist forces in many states on the basis of cooperation agreements and military aid accords concluded mainly to the benefit of London, Paris, and Washington.

In Central America, El Salvador has the unfortunate privilege of being, for the moment, the key place where imperialism's counteroffensive, with the direct intervention of Washington, is being outlined.

The dead end of the Soviet bureaucracy's policy

It is not possible to fight against imperialism's remilitarization drive without taking into account the essential characteristics of the Kremlin bureaucracy's military policy, especially insofar as the imperialists' leaders justify their policy to the masses by referring to the existence of a so-called Soviet threat, which supposedly results from the superiority of the

latter's military potential.

The bureaucracy's military policy is only one aspect of its international policy — albeit an essential one. Due to its socially conservative character, it wants to avoid both any brutal rupture of the world's key equilibriums and any internal threat against the bureaucratic dictatorship which would wear away the bases of its power. These are the two preoccupations which fundamentally determine its defense policy. To this extent its policy has to be judged by its practical consequences and its relation to the concrete developments of the situation. For revolutionary Marxists who have always been intransigent on the unconditional defense of the social base of the workers states (even if they are degenerated), while at the same time carrying out an unflinching struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of the bureaucracy, the following question is posed: Is this or that action of Moscow necessary from the point of view of the defense of the USSR and the other workers states against imperialism? What are the effects on the world revolution, whose development is the only long-term guarantee for the existence of the workers states?

When the USSR in 1949 equipped itself with a nuclear capacity, our position was to defend its right to an independent defense policy — faced with the threat represented by U.S. imperialism in sole possession of an atomic arsenal. In the same way we recognized the right of the Chinese workers state in 1964 to do so. From a revolutionary point of view these means of nuclear self-defense were necessary to dissuade imperialism from using aggression in the short term with nuclear weapons against those territories where the capitalists had been thrown out. It has to be reaffirmed that without the existence of Soviet and Chinese nuclear arms, imperialism would have probably used atomic bombs against the Chinese, Indochinese, and indeed Cuban revolutions.

However the bureaucracy's defense policy pursues contradictory objectives as a result of the social nature of the former. Thus, constrained to face up to imperialism's threats, it rejects the correct policy of encouraging mass mobilizations in the main imperialist strongholds. It holds back and tries to break revolutionary processes in numerous countries. The result is a situation where fundamentally it responds to imperialism's arms race only by increasing its military potential — at an exorbitant cost.

Therefore, in the area of nuclear weapons, an effective defense policy would combine providing the country with the most sophisticated capabilities, along with dramatic disarmament initiatives involving previously stockpiled nuclear matériel — for example, armaments in excess of the already existing ability of the United States and USSR to destroy the whole human race. The accumulation of nuclear warheads without any other objective than to appear not to lose face in relation to imperialism is unjustified from a revolutionary, internationalist, and proletarian point of view.

In the same way, the deployment of arms

such as the SS-20, aimed at China and Europe and incapable of reaching the United States, is not founded on the point of view of the defense of the USSR and provides an excellent pretext for imperialism to justify its rearmament drive among the masses in the West.

The truth is that it fears above all the anti-capitalist, revolutionary, mobilizations of the masses and prefers bargaining with imperialism in SALT or MBFR (Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions) conferences. The bureaucracy has a defense policy that is exceptionally costly for the Soviet masses and in the end not very effective from the point of view of defending the workers states themselves. To this extent it facilitates the permanent pressure imperialism imposes on the Soviet economy. It also aids, if not provokes, the development of neutralist currents which lump together Soviet nuclear defense policy with that of imperialism. But the bureaucracy prefers that to the emergence of mass revolutionary currents that threaten the world status quo, and through that even its own existence.

The utopian and suicidal position according to which the "socialist" countries have to be able to win — in the event of a nuclear war — flows from the same orientation.

On the contrary it is necessary to make it impossible for imperialism to use its formidable nuclear arsenal by intervening at two levels: by developing the mobilization of the workers in the imperialist countries against their own bourgeoisies; and by maintaining sufficient means of self-defense and dissuasion which are worked out and presented as such. An effective policy of defending the workers states cannot leave out the national and international mobilizations of the masses. The nature of the bureaucracy prevents it from having such a revolutionary policy because it would erode the bases of its power. In this sense the military propaganda and practice of the bureaucracy are also obstacles in the struggle for the disarmament of imperialism.

However, Moscow's military policy is not limited to participating in the arms race in the

wake of imperialism. It also includes an openly counterrevolutionary dimension of maintaining the bureaucratic dictatorship in the "socialist camp." The quantitative development of the Soviet conventional arsenal, in particular its navy and army, does not only correspond to the necessity of defense against imperialism. It also directly threatens the development of the political revolution in the USSR, as well as in the other workers states in Eastern Europe. This is furthermore the basis of the Brezhnev Doctrine of "limited sovereignty," which regulates relations between the USSR and the other workers states that are members of the Warsaw Pact.

The Kremlin's military policy is also characterized by a total secrecy that leaves the door wide open for the West's manipulation of public opinion. A policy of secrecy is absurd today when technological progress in the field of observation, detection, and surveillance by spy satellites permits imperialism's leaders to know more or less precisely the quantitative and qualitative value of the USSR's real potential. The example of the recent "revelations" of the Pentagon on the evolution of the size of arms production centers in the USSR proves this.

On the other hand the masses in the West and the East are left in the most absolute ignorance and are at the mercy of Western militarist propaganda campaigns. The consequence is that each time the bureaucracy sees imperialism grant it an overvalued military capacity, Moscow, fearing to lose face, is careful not to deny it. A real alternative would be an open policy on the actual levels of arms stocks, with the aim of winning the masses' confidence in order to put imperialism on the spot — including through bold proposals for international control. Such an orientation implies abandoning all secret diplomacy within the revolutionary perspective of the disarmament of imperialism. The bureaucracy would never decide to do that.

The struggle for peace and socialism

New developments in the world revolution help make the necessary struggle for peace and socialism relevant on a mass scale. This slogan, taken up by broad anticapitalist currents in the present context of the general remilitarization offensive of imperialism, can take on its full internationalist and proletarian significance. Faced with imperialism — a synonym for murderous wars, indeed of the threat of the nuclear holocaust for all humanity — only the expropriation of capital in the main developed countries, the establishment of a world socialist federation, and the banning of the manufacture of large arms can guarantee peace through disarmament. The international policy of the bureaucracy represents an obstacle on this road through the objective support it gives to imperialism's attempts to reinforce its own bases. But the bureaucracy is no longer capable (unlike in the fifties) of channeling and disorienting the antiwar movement, which is growing today in the whole of Western Europe and will

Your library should get *Intercontinental Press.*

Intercontinental Press is a unique source for political developments throughout the world. *IP* is the only English-language magazine with a full-time bureau in Managua, providing weekly reports on the development of the revolutionary upsurge in Central America. *IP* correspondents provide our readers with in-depth coverage of events such as the Iranian revolution, the freedom struggle in South Africa, and the workers struggle in Poland.

Many of the documents, speeches, and interviews we publish appear nowhere else in English. Why not ask your library to subscribe? Make sure others get a chance to read *IP* too.

develop tomorrow in the United States.

Mass campaigns, which vary according to the precise themes taken up in each country as a function of their particular situations, are beginning to be set up just about everywhere. Revolutionary forces that participate have the duty to bring them together on one objective that is also now central within the workers movement: to hold back imperialism's war preparations; to stop its criminal rush to war by weakening it in a decisive way and then overturning it. These growing mobilizations are of great importance, with young people in general playing a frontline role. They are provoking differentiations inside the traditional forces of the workers movement. These are already very deep and will become more profound. There are many reasons that justify the support and participation of the Fourth International in this movement.

Within these mobilizations, which bring together the most diverse political currents, it is important to draw out a series of key axes that unify over and beyond the national situations, the struggle against imperialism, its austerity and remilitarization policies. It is only through such an approach that we can lay the political basis for an advance of the antiwar movement toward international coordination, at least on the level of Western Europe as a whole.

The situation from one country to another is very different as concerns the objective place of each national military apparatus in the global imperialist network. But above all the traditions and level of consciousness of the masses with respect to military questions are very unevenly developed.

The situation is most favorable in Britain, where the workers movement has taken up in a mass way the slogan of unilateral disarmament.

In West Germany and in the majority of North European countries, neutralist perspectives of bilateral disarmament generally dominate the mass movement.

In France and Italy the situation is more complex due to the role that the CPs traditionally have in the antiwar movements. In France the mobilizations are still smaller than in other European countries. This poses a problem since this country is the second military power of the Atlantic alliance after the USA.

In North America the emergence of a significant current of opposition to U.S. intervention in El Salvador and the mobilizations against the "draft" (the preparations for establishing obligatory military service), indicate the main lines along which the resurgent antiwar movement will proceed.

The breadth of the antiwar movement forces the CPs and the SPs to develop their own political positions faced with the problems raised by the remilitarization drive. Although their positions generally flow from a similar preoccupation with eliminating the anticapitalist dynamic from the mobilizations, they vary from country to country. The French social democrats remain attached to the development of a French nuclear defense system. The Italian so-

cial democrats are the least critical tendency of the workers movement towards the installation of the new Pershing missiles in Europe. The German Social Democratic Party (SPD), the Belgian and Dutch SP, as well as the British Labour Party right wing, are trying to fight against the pressure in favor of unilateral disarmament of their respective countries (already the latter position has won a majority inside the Labour Party) by demanding a parallel reduction of American and Soviet nuclear weapons in Europe. The CPs generally focus the mobilizations on the struggle against the new escalation of rearmament, but are much more discreet on the question of unilateralism or on the necessity to disarm imperialism in order to eliminate the danger of war, given their general orientation of "peaceful coexistence."

It falls on the revolutionary forces, and especially the sections of the Fourth International, to do everything possible to show the objective necessity of coordinating these mobilizations on an international scale, while adapting the tactical slogans and alliances to the concrete situations of each country (traditions and strength of the movement, level of consciousness, etc.). The Fourth International can play an essential role in this framework, and will develop the political responses that the situation requires.

The Fourth International calls on the workers, youth, and all peoples, especially those of Western Europe and North America, to mobilize against imperialism, militarism, austerity, and for peace and socialism.

A. It declares itself against the production and deployment of the neutron bomb, for the universal banning of this weapon, which tends to make possible the eventual use of the nuclear arsenal against peoples struggling against imperialism.

It will fight against the NATO decisions to install Cruise and Pershing II missiles in Europe. It is in favor of unilateral nuclear disarmament by the halting of production and the destruction of "A," "H," and "N" bomb stocks.

B. It denounces NATO and the Atlantic alliance as being against the interests of the working class and fights any enlargement of this counterrevolutionary bloc. In particular it is in solidarity with the workers and peoples of the Spanish state who are against the entry of their country into NATO. In each country its sections will put forward the necessity of leaving NATO, and in France will demand a break with the Atlantic alliance. They will struggle for the dismantling of all the "advance bases" of U.S. imperialism in Europe or nearby, in particular in the Mediterranean.

C. The Fourth International calls for the rejection of war budgets, which are the source of immense wastage of humanity's resources, especially given the fact that the elementary needs of three-quarters of the population of the globe are not satisfied and that austerity policies are imposed on the workers of the imperialist centers. It is in favor of a massive and immediate reduction in unproductive military

expenditure, for the satisfaction of workers' social needs and demands in the developed countries, and a very substantial increase in aid to the developing countries. Jobs, not bombs! Social spending, not military spending!

D. It is against the generalized militarization of the economy, the deviation of research towards military ends, the development of the production and sale of arms. It also supports the nationalization without compensation and under workers control of all industries involved in such production, and their reconversion in the framework of a democratically elaborated plan, in which the masses' social needs will determine the choices of production and not the reverse.

E. It opposes any limitation of workers' trade-union and political freedom. This is particularly valid for workers in the arms industries, who are often submitted to police control when hired and whose rights are significantly limited compared to workers in other industries (right to strike, legal status at work, and freedom of expression and organization).

F. It calls for a struggle against civil war preparations — the adoption of legislation envisaged for "crisis periods" and the preparation of bourgeois armies for the maintenance of imperialist order in Europe itself. It rejects ODT measures (operational defense of territory), free-range maneuvers, civil defense; and is opposed to the militarization of civil populations and their territories. It supports the Irish and Turkish masses, who are victims of particularly odious repression from NATO-member armies.

G. The Fourth International supports the struggles of conscripted or professional soldiers who are fighting for the full exercise of democratic rights (right to information, expression, and organization) inside the barracks. Soldiers must be able to organize on a trade-union basis completely independently from the military hierarchy. It is against the professionalization of bourgeois armies, which makes them more apt to intervene against workers, to break strikes, and to enforce requisition orders.

It fights for the reduction of the length of military service and for the right of all men and women to have real arms-training without assignment to barracks. It recognizes the democratic right of conscientious objection. □

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.

Proimperialist alliance formed

Aimed at Nicaraguan and Salvadoran revolutions

By Arnold Weissberg

MANAGUA — The foreign ministers of El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Honduras, with the open encouragement and support of Washington, announced January 19 that their governments had formed the Central American Democratic Confederation.

The alliance, a joint declaration said, was aimed at providing mutual military and economic security. The declaration also gave backing to the upcoming elections in El Salvador as the best means of providing representative government to that country.

The Salvadoran government was named coordinator of the alliance. Naming the military-Christian Democratic junta that is responsible for more than 30,000 murders, is itself enough to reveal the true nature of the "democratic" alliance.

Given U.S. strategic policy in Central America, whose chief aims are the overthrow of the Sandinista government here and the prevention of a victory by the revolutionary fighters in El Salvador, it is impossible to view this new formation as anything other than a step toward those two goals. Indeed, it was greeted by the U.S. State Department as a "positive step."

A glance at the map provides further evidence: Costa Rica and Honduras are the only two countries that border Nicaragua; and El Salvador is a short boat ride across the Gulf of Fonseca.

The new alliance's support for the upcoming electoral farce in El Salvador also suggests the label "made in USA." The Reagan administration has been pushing the elections as a way of establishing some minimal international credibility for the bloody Salvadoran junta.

The revolutionaries of the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN) and the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR) have denounced the charade, explaining that the dozens of organizations which make up the two groups cannot participate without exposing themselves to the ever-present government-run death squads.

It is feared here that the U.S. and Salvadoran governments may use the mutual defense aspects of the new alliance for military moves against Nicaragua. Both governments have long claimed, without offering any proof, that Nicaragua has been supplying arms to the

FMLN, which Nicaragua has denied. These false charges could be used to launch a military attack of a "defensive" nature.

An alleged threat from Nicaragua could also be used by Honduras to provoke a war. There has been constant tension at the Nicaragua-Honduras border, as elements of the Honduran army have cooperated with the thousands of Somozaist ex-National Guards who have been carrying out an increasing number of murderous raids into Nicaragua. The Honduran government has refused to admit responsibility, and has gone so far as to claim that it is really

Nicaragua that has violated the border.

The "democratic confederation" has come under strong criticism from many quarters. While Costa Rican National Liberation Party (PLN) presidential candidate Luis Alberto Monge expressed general support for the alliance's principles, his own party's youth organization strongly denounced it. A document signed by the youth group's president, Rodolfo Navas, declared that the alliance's aim was "to support the genocidal junta in El Salvador and help to cover up a massacre."

Also expressing their disagreement were some Costa Rican cabinet ministers.

In Nicaragua, the agreement was denounced by the Revolutionary Patriotic Front, a grouping of four prorevolutionary parties, including the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN). The FSLN daily *Barricada* has devoted several editorials to exposing the "democratic confederation" for what it really is. □

Costa Rican workers strike

Regime militarizes banana regions

MANAGUA — A bitterly fought strike by banana workers on Costa Rica's Atlantic Coast has revealed just how "democratic" that country is.

Some two thousand workers went out in late December, demanding a 48 percent wage boost (1981 inflation topped 50 percent) and a cost-of-living escalator clause.

The companies have said no, and they are being backed up by the Costa Rican government, which has responded by militarizing the banana regions. One worker was killed and five wounded by the police.

Police sealed off the strike area. Marielos Giralt, a leader of the banana workers union, said that six union leaders and hundreds of workers had been arrested.

Meanwhile, other unions representing 3,000 banana workers demanded an end to the repression. Workers on the railway that carries the bananas to port also went on strike for higher wages. They were joined by 4,000

workers at the University of Costa Rica, shutting it down. The university workers union also demanded freedom for the jailed banana workers.

President Rodrigo Carazo denounced the banana strike as a communist plot, a charge echoed by his probable successor, National Liberation Party (PLN) presidential candidate Luis Alberto Monge, whose party is a member of the Second International. Monge charged that communists in the leadership of the banana workers union were trying to create "turbulence" so that Costa Rica could not have the "free, democratic, and peaceful elections" scheduled for February 7.

Monge did not have to resort to conspiracy theories to explain the strike. The cost of a typical Costa Rican "market basket" of basic foods doubled January 5, as Carazo's government, responding to pressure from the International Monetary Fund, withdrew subsidies of rice, beans, and meat. Drinking water rates went up 90 percent at the same time. □

Honduras blackmailed by Texaco

In Honduras, Texaco has the entire country by the throat. For the seventh time in three years, the giant U.S. oil firm, which runs the country's only refinery, has shut down its operations, virtually paralyzing transportation and nearly causing severe food shortages. This time, the company's excuse had to do with an alleged failure by the government to provide proper financing for oil purchases.

In the past, Texaco has claimed "routine

maintenance" as the reason for a shutdown. However, the real reason is that Texaco wants the Honduran government either to buy the refinery, at a highly inflated price, or permit steep price hikes in cooking gas, gasoline, and other petroleum products.

The government has thus far refused Texaco's blackmail, but it has also failed to take any decisive action that would halt the blackmail once and for all.

**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.