
INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

combined
with *inprecor*

Vol. 20, No. 35

November 29, 1982

USA \$1.25

UK 50p

Fightback Shapes Up Among U.S. and Canadian Workers



Chrysler workers on strike in Canada.

Grenada, Cuba, and the Caribbean

- **Maurice Bishop Answers Slander Campaign**
- **Interview With Carlos Rafael Rodríguez**

**On-the-Spot Report
Poland Today:
The Fight for
Democratic Unions**

A fightback shapes up among U.S. and Canadian workers

By Will Reissner

North America is sunk in its deepest economic crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s. According to official figures, unemployment in the United States is more than 10.4 percent of the workforce and rising. In Canada the figure is 12.2 percent.

U.S. factories are operating at only 68.4 percent of capacity, the lowest level since the government began keeping records in 1948. U.S. officials acknowledge that this figure would be even lower were not so many plants already shut down altogether.

In Canada, industrial production has dropped more than 16 percent, and the government in Ottawa predicts that overall economic output will have plummeted more than 4 percent by the end of the year.

In industry after industry, U.S. and Canadian capitalists have used the crisis of their economic system to demand that workers give up hard-won gains in wages, benefits, and job conditions.

The bosses' demands for concessions have been actively supported by the highest levels of the trade-union bureaucracy. These labor misleaders, totally steeped in class collaborationism, put forward the view that employers must prosper before the workers can prosper. They urge the rank-and-file to give up what the labor movement won in previous struggles.

The AFL-CIO officialdom parrots the line of the bosses and the U.S. and Canadian governments that current wage levels and "lax" work rules make North American industry uncompetitive and therefore cause the layoffs and plant closings.

Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau recently put this view forward in several televised speeches calling for labor to sharply reduce its demands for wage increases. He asked Canadian workers to ponder the question, "Can we compete, not against other Canadians . . . but against the automaker of Japan, the lumber worker of Scandinavia, the wheat farmer of Nebraska?"

Union officials in Canada and the United States have taken up this refrain. They tell the ranks that if "our" companies are to be able to compete, the employers need wage relief and greater control over work rules. The union officialdom seconds the bosses' insistence that improvements in wages and working conditions must be tied to increased profits.

Lessons being drawn

Under the initial blows of the economic downturn, many workers were conned into accepting this argument.

But three years of bitter experience with

concessions have started to convince many workers that givebacks have not saved jobs or solved economic problems. They have begun to see that concessions simply set in motion a deadly spiral leading to demands for further concessions.

In recent weeks, this changing consciousness has been demonstrated by Chrysler workers, steelworkers, coal miners, and public employees in North America.

Chrysler workers reject contract

Three years ago — under concerted pressure from management, the Carter administration, and the United Auto Workers union leadership — Chrysler workers agreed to a far-reaching package of givebacks. Without these sacrifices, they were told, the company would go bankrupt, and they would all lose their jobs. Faced with these grim alternatives, Chrysler workers accepted the need for "equality of sacrifice."

The 1979 Chrysler contract was hailed by the entire employing class as a model to be applied throughout U.S. and Canadian industry.

But when the contract came up for renewal in mid-October, U.S. Chrysler workers voted down the new pact negotiated by the UAW leadership. The rejected contract offered no immediate wage increase or job protection, and contained further concessions on speedup and work rules.

In Canada, Chrysler workers were offered the same contract. They too rejected it and went on strike November 5.

In the aftermath of these votes, UAW President Douglas Fraser, who has a seat on the Chrysler board of directors, felt enough heat to temporarily step down from the company post.

Chrysler workers learned the hard way that concessions do not save jobs. In 1979, when Chrysler demanded that workers accept significantly lower wages and benefits than those received by General Motors and Ford workers, the company employed 76,000 workers. Three years later — after they gave up an estimated \$1.06 billion in wages and benefits and are now paid \$2.68 per hour less than GM and Ford workers — there are only 45,000 Chrysler workers left.

Today Chrysler is sitting on more than \$1 billion in cash, but still wants more concessions.

Chrysler workers have said "enough is enough!" The 10,000 Canadian strikers have had no raise since March 1980, despite two years of double-digit inflation in Canada. As a result, their buying power has dropped more than 25 percent.

The strikers in Canada are receiving support

from U.S. Chrysler workers, who know that the outcome in Canada will have a big impact on their own upcoming struggle for a new contract. Ford and GM workers also have a big stake in the outcome, since these corporations have used the Chrysler concessions to demand similar givebacks.

The Toronto *Globe and Mail* described the Chrysler strikers as "lemmings rushing to the ocean" who "seem to have an uncontrollable urge to hurry to the unemployment lines."

But these auto workers know that three years of concessions did not keep more than 30,000 of their colleagues from the unemployment lines.

The rejection of the Chrysler contract in the United States and Canada shows that workers are beginning to break from the deadend strategy of class collaboration — the idea that what is good for the company is good for them.

"I can't meet my mortgage payments with another wage freeze," one striker told the Canadian Broadcasting Company. "Neither can a lot of the fellows in the plant. If we're going to go under, we're going to make damn sure the company does too."

Another worker was not impressed with company claims that it would go bankrupt if the workers refuse more concessions. "Let it go down," he said. "I'm going down."

The Canadian UAW members are showing that the way to fight for jobs is to stand up for the interests of their class, no matter what the employers say the results will be for profits and business prospects.

Steelworkers say "no"

Just as the UAW's 1979 Chrysler contract was a model the employers tried to ram down the throats of other workers, so too was the no-strike pledge the United Steelworkers of America agreed to with the steel companies in 1973.

But rank-and-file steelworkers are also drawing the lessons of their experiences over the past decade. And they are resisting company demands for greater concessions.

On November 18, the executive board of the USWA unanimously accepted a 45-month contract that would have reduced average earnings for steelworkers by \$1.50 per hour in cash and 75 cents in benefits in the first year alone.

Steelworkers President Lloyd McBride claimed the bosses insisted on these takebacks, and that a strike would only lead to greater use of imported steel.

But the very next day, 600 local USWA officials, who are more in touch with the mood of the ranks, overwhelmingly rejected the contract. Clearly the example of the Chrysler workers encouraged this resistance.

Following the vote, McBride said that he had tried to persuade industry negotiators not to insist on so many concessions. But "the industry said these were things they had to have," he lamented.

On November 9, U.S. coal miners sent a strong signal that they intend for their union to

fight hard for their interests by voting out incumbent United Mine Workers President Sam Church. Church had vowed to return the union to cooperation with the mine owners. In his place, the miners elected Richard Trumka, who campaigned against giving up past gains won by the union.

In 1972 the miners ousted the corrupt regime of Tony Boyle, who was noted for sweetheart deals with the mine owners and terrorism against the rank-and-file. Through that battle for union democracy, the miners won the right to vote on their contract — a weapon they have put to good use. Since then the UMWA has been the single biggest obstacle in the labor movement to the takeback campaign of the employers and their government.

In 1977 the mine owners proposed a contract that contained provisions against the right to strike, drastic curbs on the power of union safety committees, and sharp reductions in health and retirement benefits.

Although the union president recommended acceptance of that contract, the miners voted it down and struck for 111 days for a better deal. In the process they defied the Carter administration, which invoked a Taft-Hartley "back to work" order.

In 1981 the miners again blocked company attempts to cripple the union and expand nonunion coal. Voting down the first contract proposal, which had been endorsed by UMWA President Church, they struck for 77 days before a settlement was reached.

Today the miners face a stepped-up drive by the employers, who insist that profits must come before miners' health and safety, or their right to a decent living.

With tens of thousands of miners on layoffs, the coal companies have instituted speedup and cutbacks on safety. The mining of nonunion coal has sharply increased. The Reagan administration is trying to gut federal health and safety legislation.

All these issues will come to a head when the union contract expires in September 1984. By rejecting the policies of the Church misleadership, the miners have taken a big step toward arming their union for that fight.

The editors of the *Washington Post* registered their concern over the miners vote and the Chrysler strike: "The election results suggested that UMW members refuse to accept the fact that the coal industry does not exist in a vacuum and that miners' wages ultimately depend on the competitiveness of the product they produce. It is a fact others like to ignore: the Chrysler workers who are striking in Canada, for example."

One-day strike in Quebec

In Quebec on November 10, hundreds of thousands of public-sector workers showed their determination to resist cuts in their wages and elimination of thousands of jobs by staging a one-day strike that shut down schools, Montreal mass transit, and many of the province's health facilities. The workers also authorized union leaders to organize a general

strike of unlimited duration if the need arises.

In pressing their demands, the public-sector workers rejected the provincial government's claim that economic disaster looms over Quebec unless expenditures are drastically reduced.

As all these developments show, a new

mood is developing among workers in the United States and Canada. They are beginning to see that the way to defend their jobs and living standards is to use the power of their unions to resist the employers' demands, not to seek ways to cooperate with the bosses in boosting profits. A fightback is beginning to shape up. □

IN THIS ISSUE

Closing News Date: November 20, 1982

NICARAGUA	828	Rallies honor FSLN founder — by Michael Baumann
	828	Sandinistas counter sabotage by banana monopoly — by Jane Harris
	841	Art in a revolutionary society — by Jane Harris
EL SALVADOR	829	Honduran army aids antirebel drive — by Fred Murphy
ISRAEL	831	Palestinian press under attack — Interview with editor of "Al Fajr"
WEST BANK	848	Polls show Palestinians back PLO
POLAND	832	The fight for democratic unions — by Ernest Harsch
	834	Regime frees Lech Walesa — by Ernest Harsch
IRAN	835	Workers hail victories, volunteer for front — by Fred Murphy
	835	Socialists present candidates
	843	War and revolution in Iran — Interview with HKS leader
	847	"Socialism and Revolution"
GRENADA	836	Terrorists sentenced in bombing that killed three
	839	Government answers charges at CARICOM summit — by Ernest Harsch
QUEBEC	837	Public employees stage one-day strike
CARIBBEAN	838	Cuba and its island neighbors — Interviews with Carlos Rafael Rodríguez and Ricardo Alarcón
USA	842	Jury frees IRA supporters — by Will Reissner
NEWS ANALYSIS	826	Fightback shapes up among U.S. and Canadian workers — by Will Reissner

Intercontinental Press (ISSN 0162-5594).
Intercontinental Press, 410 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014. Published in New York every other 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 Maitan, 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 subscriptions in the U.S. or Canada send US\$25.00. Subscription correspondence should be addressed to: Intercontinental Press, 410 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014. Telephone: (212) 929-6933.

For airmail subscriptions to Britain, Ireland, and continental Europe send US\$35.00 for one year; US\$17.50 for six months. Write for subscription rates to all other countries.

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.

We prefer payment in bank drafts or postal checks payable in U.S. dollars because of the charges involved in clearing personal checks drawn on other currencies. However, personal checks will be accepted, with an additional 5 percent added for clearing charges.

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.

Rallies honor FSLN founder, promote defense preparations

By Michael Baumann

MATAGALPA, Nicaragua — In the wake of the White House's admission that it is directly organizing military attacks on Nicaragua by counterrevolutionaries in Honduras, the Nicaraguan government has stepped up defense preparations.

A mass meeting of more than 10,000 here November 7 capped a week of intensive activities.

Mobilizations, factory meetings, and militia and neighborhood defense committee meetings focused on explaining the aims and gains of the revolution, the inevitability of increasing conflict with the warmakers in Washington, and the political understanding needed to prepare for the conflict.

The week's activities were based around commemoration of the anniversary of the death of Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) founder Carlos Fonseca, killed in battle by National Guard troops November 8, 1976. Next to Augusto Sandino, Carlos Fonseca is Nicaragua's most prominent revolutionary figure.

The masses' voluntary participation in the week's events took on the character of standing up to be counted. In one activity or another, hundreds of thousands took part to show their support for the revolution.

The reactionary daily *La Prensa*, mouthpiece of Nicaragua's capitalist class, understood perfectly the significance of these meetings, assemblies, and marches. It printed not one word about them.

Commander Henry Ruiz, minister of planning, spoke for the FSLN national leadership at the mass meeting here in Matagalpa, birthplace of Carlos Fonseca. He pulled no punches in describing what Nicaragua is up against.

"The counterrevolution," he said, "is advancing, step by step as the revolution deepens. As the masses of people gain consciousness of a better destiny, of a secure future, it sends shivers down the spines of the local and regional oligarchies. Our country's old exploiting classes, displaced from power, are regrouping abroad," where they are "organizing terror against our people."

Economically, Nicaragua faces two years of "extreme difficulty," Ruiz said. Workers' jobs are threatened because "we do not have sufficient hard currency to import the raw materials and commodities we need." The imperialists abroad "are paying us less and charging us more." The big cotton farmers at home "are each day planting less and complaining more."

Just paying interest and principal on the foreign debt, Ruiz said, "will take more than

90 percent of next year's export earnings."

The reactionaries charge the FSLN with "betraying the principles of the revolution." But the real crime in their eyes is the radical social change the revolution has brought about.

"That is why they hate us. . . . They know we are fighting to create an economic, social, and political system in which the exploitation of man by man is eliminated, in which peoples can live in peace!" Ruiz said.

Ten thousand workers and farmers, students and soldiers, standing in the scorching midday sun, showed with applause and cheers that this is their goal too.

A few days later, on November 10, thousands of Sandinista youth group members marched to the Honduran embassy in the capital city of Managua. There they demanded the immediate return of 42 coffee pickers who had been kidnapped by counterrevolutionaries and taken to Honduras two days earlier.

The following evening their chants were echoed in the northern border town of Ocotal by mothers of coffee pickers in another demonstration.

So steady have been the attacks coming from Honduras that Nobel Prize novelist Gabriel García Márquez declined an invitation from Honduran President Roberto Suazo Córdova, explaining that he would never travel to the country as long as it was being used as a base of operations to attack Nicaragua.

Meanwhile, on November 12, Honduran Foreign Minister Edgardo Paz Barnica came here for a day of talks with Daniel Ortega, coordinator of the Nicaraguan government junta. The meeting came after Nicaragua had sent 52 letters of protest to Honduras concerning border attacks and other aggression. In the meeting, Ortega repeated the Nicaraguan government's readiness to hold discussions with the Honduran government to achieve peace. □

Sandinistas counter sabotage by giant U.S. banana monopoly

By Jane Harris

MANAGUA, Nicaragua — The revolutionary government here has won a battle in the economic war being waged against it by U.S. imperialism. Nicaragua has found 25 new U.S. distributors to buy its banana crop, following the October 26 announcement by U.S.-owned Standard Fruit that it was pulling out of its 1980 contract to market this country's bananas through 1985.

Just two weeks after the pullout, Nicaragua delivered 80,000 crates of bananas to California. The sale represented 15 percent of banana consumption on the West Coast.

The decision by Standard Fruit threatened the jobs of 4,000 banana workers, as well as \$24 million a year in badly needed export income. The move was transparently linked to Washington's counterrevolutionary offensive against the Sandinista-led workers and farmers government. This offensive combines military operations launched from neighboring Honduras with a wide range of economic, political, and diplomatic pressures.

Although the company claimed that financial difficulties made it necessary to violate the 1980 contract, government officials here pointed out that Nicaragua is the only banana-exporting country that is being completely cut out by Standard Fruit. Purchases from other

Central American countries have only been reduced.

Standard Fruit is a division of the giant U.S. food monopoly Castle & Cooke, which markets many of its products under the "Dole" brand name. It controls the shipment and sale of bananas to the United States, which is by far the world's largest market for the fruit.

To add insult to injury, company representatives in Honduras had initially circulated rumors that they had been "kicked out" by the Sandinistas. The government denounced that charge as absolutely false, explaining that it had sought to maintain cordial relations with the company since signing the contract at the end of 1980.

The contract followed the government's nationalization of banana production in that year, including Standard Fruit's holdings. This measure, aimed at meeting demands by plantation workers for improved wages and working conditions, had initially been met by threats from Standard Fruit to refuse to market the Nicaraguan crop. The company was forced to back down, however, and signed the five-year marketing agreement. Now, as imperialist military and economic attacks have sharply escalated, the giant monopoly has done its bit by pulling out altogether.

Quickly countering this attempted sabotage

of the Nicaraguan economy, the government has now established new markets for the fruit on the West Coast of the United States at a price one-third higher than what Standard Fruit had been paying.

The minister of agrarian reform, Commander Jaime Wheelock, warned that Nicaragua's efforts to avoid being frozen out of the U.S. banana market are not over. The opening of these new markets on the West Coast, he said, could produce a banana price war, because Standard will do everything in its power to maintain its monopoly.

Castle & Cooke official Victor Hinz has declared that if Nicaragua continues to sell its produce on the West Coast, "then we're going to fight to the end. We're going to bury them before they begin and flood the market with bananas."

Commander Wheelock said that if Nicaragua is able to do nothing more than save the banana workers' jobs, this would be seen as a victory.

On another front in the economic war, the

United States' ability to block loans and aid for Nicaragua has resulted in a scarcity of hard currency here. The revolutionary government has adopted a number of measures to confront this problem.

To continue foreign trade without dollars, a special law has been enacted to facilitate direct exchange of goods with other countries in Central America, several of which face dollar shortages too. Forty-four barter operations, securing the equivalent of almost \$15 million in imports, have already taken place this year. Under the new law, the transactions will be regulated and organized by the Central Bank of Nicaragua.

The president of the Council of State, Commander Carlos Núñez, pointed out that even if U.S. pressure had driven Nicaragua back to precapitalist forms of economic exchange, the country would survive by taking this and other emergency measures.

Action has also been taken to aid the thousands of workers who have been thrown

out of jobs here by the closing of plants unable to get raw materials or replacement parts for lack of U.S. dollars.

The revolutionary junta announced in late October an \$18 million crash program that will create jobs for some 8,000 workers. The jobs will be mostly in road construction, coffee plantation renovation, reforestation, and a new agricultural cooperative.

Members of Nicaragua's military reserve battalions — all voluntary and unpaid — were understandably having grave difficulties paying their rent, loans, and bills. Legislation was therefore passed in the Council of State forbidding legal proceedings against activated members of the reserves.

Additional relief from money worries — especially for the unemployed — came on November 10, when the Council of State suspended all evictions for 60 days. A law that is expected to do away with rent altogether, converting it into a form of mortgage payment, is also in the works. □

El Salvador

Honduran army aids antirebel drive

FMLN's offensive exposed cracks in regime

By Fred Murphy

A full month went by in El Salvador before the regime's forces began a serious counterattack against one of the biggest rebel offensives of the civil war. Only on November 11 were more than 4,000 troops sent into action in northern Chalatenango Province, a stronghold of the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN).

On the other side of the border adjacent to Chalatenango, some 2,000 Honduran troops with artillery and helicopters were massed as part of a plan to trap the guerrilla fighters and block their escape.

The coordinated action by the two U.S.-backed armies came after a sudden 48-hour visit to El Salvador by Gen. Wallace Nutting, chief of the U.S. Southern Command in Panama.

There were also reports — denied by the rebels — that the regime was sending 9,000 troops to Morazán Province, where FMLN fighters had gained total control over all areas north of the Torola River.

The main result of such government counteroffensives in the past have been massacres of the civilian population. In Morazán, United Press International reported November 12, "about 1,500 peasants fled north to the town of Corinto from La Sociedad to escape heavy fighting and bombing."

In its offensive that began October 10, the FMLN succeeded in routing the regime's

forces from more than 20 towns in Chalatenango, Morazán, and San Miguel provinces. Half a dozen army posts were destroyed along the main highway from the capital to Chalatenango. Large quantities of arms and ammunition, including heavy weaponry, were captured. The FMLN also reported causing some 600 casualties among the government troops and taking more than 100 prisoners of war.

Why was the regime so slow in responding to these rebel advances? Defense Minister Gen. José Guillermo García claimed he was trying not to "fall into the trap of the subversives" by launching a counterattack too hastily. But there were also reports that García had held key units — including the U.S.-trained Atlacatl and Beloso battalions — near the capital in order to prevent a coup d'état. These reports came amid a series of disputes that surfaced among the regime's factions and their U.S. patrons.

In a sharply worded speech to the Chamber of Commerce in San Salvador October 29, U.S. Ambassador Deane Hinton warned the local rulers publicly that they should clean up their act and reduce the summary execution of civilians. "You don't have to kill people in the night," he scolded. And if those who murdered U.S. citizens in December 1980 and January 1981 were not brought to justice, Hinton declared, the United States "could be forced to

deny assistance to El Salvador."

Hinton's aim was to bolster forces in the regime like General García and the Christian Democratic Party, who are willing to pay lip service to human rights and maintain a facade of reforms. He also wanted to make more convincing the Reagan administration's claims that it is pressing for "progress" in these areas in El Salvador.

Hinton and García were immediately denounced in newspaper advertisements by Salvadoran business groups and by extreme-rightist organizations led by Constituent Assembly president Maj. Roberto D'Aubuisson. According to the November 7 *New York Times*, D'Aubuisson was trying "to encourage opposition to General García among army officers and the public in the hope of unseating him."

Christian Democratic leader Napoleón Duarte told the *Times* that a "complete confrontation" was under way between García and D'Aubuisson and that the latter was seeking "a legal coup d'état" to oust the U.S.-backed defense minister.

Shortly after General Nutting's quick visit, however, the coup threat was apparently defused. On November 8 a shakeup in army commands was announced. A series of provincial chiefs were transferred, and D'Aubuisson's associate Col. Nicolás Carranza was removed as head of the state-run telecommunications company (where he had had access to all messages sent and received in the country). The colonel

in charge of the immigration bureau was also ousted.

Only after these personnel shifts were effected did the counteroffensive against the FMLN get under way.

Besides helping García to further consolidate his position in the armed forces, Washington made some other gains in the aftermath of Hinton's speech. On November 15, five National Guard troops (one sergeant and four privates) were ordered to stand trial for the December 1980 murders of four U.S. Catholic women missionaries.

In the Constituent Assembly (installed after the elections last March in which only the proimperialist parties could compete), the relationship of forces has shifted in favor of the policies Washington wants applied. The Christian Democrats had been in a minority, but they have now forged a bloc with a splinter from the National Conciliation Party (PCN — the traditional political vehicle of the military) and with the tiny Democratic Action Party (PAD). Together these groups now claim 31 of the assembly's 60 seats, putting D'Aubuisson and the extreme rightists in a minority.

This victory may be of only limited value to Washington, however. According to the November 7 *New York Times*, "the Assembly has spent the bulk of its time on patronage, in finding and exchanging jobs for party members."

Certification charade

Having strengthened its hand in the military and the assembly, the Reagan administration next moved to try to repair the damage in its relations with the extreme right. Thus White House officials made known to the press on November 9 that Ambassador Hinton had been told to refrain from making any more public criticisms. They asserted that his controversial speech had not been cleared by the White House, and stated that in any case it was "not intended to represent any change in either the substance or style of U.S. diplomacy" in El Salvador.

The whole charade of public U.S. complaints, right-wing outrage, partial amends by the regime, and a rhetorical pullback by Washington has been played out more than once in the past. While such episodes reveal the dilemmas facing U.S. policy makers, they also help the Reagan administration claim that progress is being made in fostering democracy and respect for human rights in El Salvador.

The U.S. Congress — acting under the pressure of massive antiwar sentiment among working people — has required Reagan to formally certify progress in these areas every six months. Thus statements like the ambassador's have become "almost cyclical, seasonal events keyed to the particular rhythm of the six-month certification process," well-known U.S. novelist Joan Didion wrote in the December 2 *New York Review of Books*; "midway in the certification cycle things appear 'bad,' and are then made, at least rhetorically, to appear 'bet-

ter,' 'improvement' being the key to certification."

The scheduled trial of the guardsmen accused of killing the U.S. religious workers will now be duly cited as "progress." The November 16 *New York Times* reported that the trial "is expected to be a speedy one, according to the judge's secretary, who said a verdict could also be reached in early January." Conveniently, this will be just in time for the next certification deadline, January 28.

The families of the slain women, however, have already denounced the whole proceeding as a cover-up designed to hide the involvement of top Salvadoran officials in the killings.

"I am sorry to say that our government is looking for a trial of the five [guardsmen] and to forget the whole thing," William Ford, brother of Ita Ford, told a Senate hearing in August. "The families are determined not to let this happen."

Michael Donovan, brother of Jean Donovan, told the same hearing that a Salvadoran attorney hired by the State Department itself had informed family members that there is "reason to suspect the direct involvement of senior officers . . . and officials of the Salvadoran government" in the murders.

According to Donovan's father, the lawyer "said that if the five soldiers are ever brought to trial, their defense will bring before the judge ample evidence showing that the investigation into the crime, as conducted by the government of El Salvador, with the assistance of the FBI and the U.S. Embassy in San Salvador, is so flawed, incomplete and inconsistent, particularly with regard to upper echelon involvement, that no part of it can be relied upon. He felt confident the soldiers would be acquitted on that basis" (*Washington Post*, August 14).

Reagan's certification problems are further compounded by the fact that death-squad killings have not abated. Thirteen more victims were recorded in the days just after Hinton's speech. And the centerpiece of the U.S. "reform" program, land distribution, has been almost totally blocked by the extreme rightists now in charge of the agriculture ministries.

Nor is there any sign of recovery in the Salvadoran economy. Some 300 factories have been shut down, and exports dropped by 26 percent last year while the foreign debt climbed by 46 percent. Unemployment surpasses 30 percent. Estimates of capital flight over the past three years range from \$740 million (Ambassador Hinton's figure) to \$1.5 billion (according to the Ministry of Planning).

With strong U.S. backing, the regime has managed to secure a series of big loans from the International Monetary Fund and the Inter-American Development Bank. The latter just approved a \$40 million credit for industrial reactivation, part of a total package of \$279 million from the two institutions.

Where much of this financial aid actually ends up was explained in an August 15 article in the *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*. Through a series of bookkeeping and black-market sub-

terfuges, the capitalists and landlords of El Salvador simply siphon it off to their bank accounts abroad.

"When the oligarchs take money out of the country," a U.S. embassy official told the *Herald-Examiner*, "it is like wringing water out of a towel until there's not a drop left.

"U.S. assistance tends to just water the towel some more, making it that much easier to wring more money out."

FMLN Commander cites gains

While Washington and the regime continue to flounder, the rebel forces have begun to draw a balance sheet on their military and political initiatives of October.

Commander Trinidad of the FMLN's Joint General Staff offered his views in an interview with the Mexico City daily *Uno más Uno*, published November 3 and 4.

The military offensive, he said, had enabled the rebels to broaden their operations to areas where they had not traditionally had a strong presence. The FMLN was also able to weaken the government's grip on major highways, such as the road from the capital to Chalatenango. And a qualitative step forward was taken in the FMLN's ability to destroy enemy units in battle and recover arms and matériel.

Three achievements were singled out by Commander Trinidad:

- With the political proposal for unconditional talks that the FMLN and the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR) made to the regime on October 26, the rebel forces were able to have an impact on politics inside the country, exposing sharp differences inside the regime. They also drew fresh attention to the fact that blame for continuing the war lies squarely with Washington and the dictatorship.

- By rapidly releasing government soldiers captured in the fighting, and by treating them well, the FMLN was able to further demoralize the ranks of the armed forces. The soldiers could see that their commanders were lying when they claimed the guerrillas killed or tortured prisoners. "The freed soldiers, without realizing it, spread the word about the treatment they receive from the FMLN and thus increase the possibility of [other troops'] surrendering to the insurgents."

- Finally, Commander Trinidad said, the FMLN had been able to fortify its internal unity, increasing coordination among the five armed revolutionary organizations that make up the front. The FMLN, he said, had learned to be "less voluntaristic and less idealistic about the unity process."

"Unity is moving ahead on two essential points — at the level of leadership and strategy, and at the level of the fighting ranks and the politicized masses inside the country. If progress is made toward unity in those areas, there is nothing to worry about, and that is what is happening. We are aware that secondary disagreements will persist, and may emerge at the levels of propaganda and international solidarity work. But one must not judge unity on that basis." □

Palestinian press under attack

Interview with editor of 'Al Fajr'

[As part of their ongoing harassment of the Palestinian press, the Israeli authorities arrested, tried, and convicted Sam'an Khoury, the editor of the English-language weekly edition of *Al-Fajr*, published in Jerusalem.

[After being held for 17 days at Moscobiyya detention center, Khoury was tried by a military court in Lydda on November 2 on the charge of possessing two copies of a newspaper published by one of the groups belonging to the Palestine Liberation Organization. Khoury was sentenced to one year's imprisonment, suspended for three years, and released. He was also fined 2,500 Israeli shekels.

[Two months earlier, Israeli authorities ordered the Jerusalem offices of the Translation and Press Services to be closed down for six months. Khoury is a codirector of the office.

[The following is an interview with Khoury made shortly after his release. It was obtained for *Intercontinental Press* by Kati Shur, a member of the Revolutionary Communist League (Turn), one of the two organizations in Israel affiliated to the Fourth International.]

Question. The harassment against you started before your arrest?

Answer. It started when they closed my Jerusalem office for six months on September 13. The first time they came to take some cassette tapes. The second time they took an old map of the West Bank. They said it was military. On October 3, the police called me in to an interrogation center. They interrogated me from eight in the morning until eight in the evening. On October 17 I was again called in for interrogation and kept for 48 hours.

Then, on October 19, they presented the court with a "secret file" and submitted a statement on my possession of two copies of *Al Hurriya*, a paper of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine. The papers had arrived at my office unsolicited. This was sufficient to have me arrested for 10 more days.

On October 26 I appealed for release. But they decided to hold me until the trial. Then I was released after the trial on November 2.

Q. Why did they extend your interrogation for so long?

A. I believe they were trying to get me to admit to something I didn't have or didn't do. But of course they failed.

Q. How did they treat you during the interrogation?

A. You could say that they used exhaustion methods. They made me stand during every interrogation session. At first these lasted two or



SAM'AN KHOURY

three hours. Then they were extended to more. I had to stand with a sack over my head and my hands cuffed behind my back. After I made my appeal on October 26, they made me stand for 24 hours that way, I suppose for punishment.

Q. What were they trying to achieve by your conviction?

'McCarthy Comes East'

"McCarthy Comes East," declared the headline of an editorial in the October 29 issue of the Palestinian weekly *Al Fajr*.

The editorial examined the Israeli government's efforts to silence critics within the country, both Jewish and Palestinian. It compared the government's methods to those used by Senator Joseph McCarthy in the United States in the early 1950s.

Among the examples *Al Fajr* gave was the case of Sam'an Khoury, the editor of its English-language edition.

In addition, it noted that "opposition to the war in Lebanon has been the cause for the firing of Israeli workers. Metal worker Assaf Adiv, for example, accused of 'inciting' colleagues, was released from his position with a Histadrut-run Koors Industries factory after a clash between pro- and anti-war factions."

Adiv was one of four Israeli revolutionary socialists who were fired several months ago for voicing opposition to the war on their jobs. The other three are Roni Ben-Efrat, Irma Froimovich, and Hanna Zohar, who were fired from an electronics plant. All are members of the Revolutionary Communist League (Turn), one of the two organizations in Israel affiliated to the Fourth International.

Although Adiv was subsequently ordered reinstated by a Histadrut body, the

A. I think they were trying to kill two birds with the same stone. As you know, I appealed to the high court about the closure of my office. Also, they are trying to hit *Al Fajr*, as they have been doing regularly lately. They have been sharpening the attack on *Al Fajr* by harassing its editors and journalists.

H.S. Siniora, the chief editor, has been banned from entering the West Bank or Gaza Strip for 6 to 11 months. The editor of the Arabic-language edition, Sayed Mamoun, was arrested in August. The night editor, Nabhan Khreisheh, who lives in a remote village, has been restricted to his village for six months. The Jerusalem correspondent, Talal Abu Afife, was held for 36 hours and then released. Ali Halili, the editor of the literary monthly, was called for interrogation three times lately.

Q. Do you have anything to say to people in the United States?

A. I would like to see the kind of support from the American people — and the administration — that has been given to deprived people in other cases. We hear a lot of complaints about what goes on in Poland or Afghanistan, but when it comes to the Palestinians or the Lebanese, we don't hear much.

I would also like to call on American journalists to consider the case of *Al Fajr* as their own case. □

factory managers have appealed the decision to higher bodies.

At one of several hearings on the appeal, the Histadrut Central Investigative Committee offered on October 24 to reinstate Adiv if he agreed to "stop talking politics." Adiv refused.

In a November 16 telephone interview, Adiv explained that this demand "is a clear attempt to silence me and what I stand for: opposition to Israel's genocidal war in Lebanon and defense of the interests of the workers, especially the Arab workers." He termed the committee's demand "McCarthyist."

"I believe it is not only the question of the right to speak to my coworkers on anything I would like to," Adiv said. "The real question here is the moral and human obligation not to let Begin's war crimes, racism, and chauvinism go unchallenged."

An article in the October 24 *Al Hamishmar*, a daily identified with the left wing of the Labor Party, called Adiv's case a "political witch-hunt" and asserted that the "factory administration should be put on trial, not Adiv. . . ."

"The result of the 'Assaf case' is no less important than the investigation of the Sabra and Shatila massacre," *Al Hamishmar* wrote, "because it will decide the future of freedom of expression." □

The fight for democratic unions

Jaruzelski seeks to shackle labor movement

By Ernest Harsch

GDANSK — The huge cranes of the Lenin Shipyard move slowly across the skyline, visible from many different parts of this old port city. They are an imposing testament to the productive capacities of the Polish working class.

They are also a constant reminder of the militancy of the tens of thousands of shipyard workers in the area, whose struggle for workers' rights over the years has come to symbolize the hopes and aspirations of working people throughout the country.

When the workers of the Lenin Shipyard launched their historic occupation strike in August 1980, one of their first acts was to paint a big X through the name of the old government-run trade union in the yard. Of their 21 strike demands, the first and most important was for the right to set up independent unions run democratically by the workers themselves.

It was a demand that they won. And with the rise of the 10-million-member Independent and Self-governing Trade Union, Solidarity, they enjoyed that right until Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski declared martial law on Dec. 13, 1981.

Now, more than two years after that right was first won, the Polish authorities are seeking to turn back the clock entirely.

By officially "dissolving" Solidarity on October 8 and ordering the formation of new unions, the regime is aiming to impose its version of what trade unions should be in the Polish workers state. The government wants powerless organizations that follow the directives of the privileged bureaucracy that governs Poland. It does not want organizations that defend the interests of the workers and promote their knowledge of, control over, and participation in the administration of the factories, economic planning, and the state.

"The new law has a lot of beautiful language," a former Solidarity activist told me. "It talks about 'independent' unions, 'self-governing' unions. But it's a joke. We had our independent and self-governing trade union. And now they're trying to destroy it. They don't want real workers unions. They never did."

'We will fight for our union'

On October 11 — the first workday after Solidarity's banning — the workers of the Lenin Shipyard again went on strike, in a spontaneous protest. They were soon joined by the workers of the Gdansk Repair Shipyard, the Northern Shipyard, the Gdansk Port, the Paris Commune Shipyard in nearby Gdynia, and

other factories and workplaces in the area.

Many people rallied outside the gate of the Lenin Shipyard, hanging up Solidarity posters, banners, and flowers. "It was almost like August 1980 all over again," one participant later commented.

In a broadcast over the clandestine Radio Solidarity on October 12, Bogdan Lis, one of the key figures in the 1980 shipyard strike and the most important Solidarity leader still at large in the Gdansk region, called for rejection of the new unions. "We will fight for union and civil rights," he declared. "The struggle for our union is continuing and will continue, because that's what millions of Poles want."

By the next day, however, the strikes in Gdansk had been broken, although protest actions were still continuing in other parts of the country. The ZOMO — Poland's notorious riot police — beat and tear-gassed demonstrators throughout the city. The Lenin Shipyard itself was "militarized" — its workers formally conscripted into the army, making any refusal to work punishable by sentences ranging between five years in prison and death.

The active protests of the shipyard workers were momentarily stifled, but their anger and defiance has continued to simmer.

On November 1 — All Saints' Day — thousands of workers with their families rallied at the monument just outside the shipyard to once again express support for their union. Chants of "Solidarity! Solidarity!" rang through the air.

Everyone here knows, however, that the struggle for workers rights — especially for the right of Solidarity to function legally — will not be an easy one. A day after the November 1 demonstration, I asked a Solidarity supporter what the banning of the union will mean for the workers movement. "It means we have a long fight ahead of us," came the reply.

'Zero option'

In pushing the new trade-union law through the Sejm (parliament), the bureaucratic authorities sought to disguise their true intentions. They cynically attempted to wrap themselves in the August 1980 strike accords concluded in Gdansk, Szczecin, and Jastrzebie, claiming to be the protectors of the workers' interests. The official press, for example, acclaimed the new law as "an opportunity to rebuild the entire union movement on the principles of August." Solidarity, the authorities charged, had abandoned those principles.

At the same time, a propaganda campaign was launched seeking to blame Solidarity's

leaders for the move. In a major speech October 7, the day before the banning of Solidarity, Deputy Prime Minister Mieczyslaw Rakowski charged that the Solidarity leaders had spurned government offers to negotiate. And "what is worst of all," he said, "they embarked on illegal underground activity."

Solidarity's underground activity — strikes, demonstrations, and the publication of uncensored union literature — has been a direct response to the bureaucracy's imposition of martial law and suspension of basic democratic and trade-union rights. If they were to continue defending their members' interests, the Solidarity leaders had little alternative but to try to carry out such activities.

Despite the crackdown, the Solidarity leaders did not turn their backs on the prospect of negotiations, as Rakowski charged. In fact, they repeatedly called on the authorities to open up a dialogue with the Solidarity leadership and other popular organizations. It was the government that spurned these offers and that excluded Solidarity supporters from the discussions of earlier drafts of the new trade-union law.

In finally deciding to ban Solidarity outright, Jaruzelski and the other members of the governing Military Council of National Salvation (WRON) also attempted to strike a pose of "fairness." They banned not only Solidarity, but *all* existing unions, including the remnants of the old government-controlled unions (known as "branch" unions) and the so-called autonomous unions, which had sometimes taken positions similar to those of Solidarity and sometimes not.

Among government circles, this was known as the "zero option."

Yet no one doubts that Solidarity, whose membership encompasses the overwhelming majority of industrial workers, was the real target.

What kinds of unions?

An article in the November 2 *Glos Wybrzeza*, the Gdansk regional organ of Jaruzelski's Polish United Workers Party (PUWP), attempted to explain the reasons for the new union law. It admitted that the law was greeted "without particular enthusiasm" and that the dissolution of the existing unions was "unpopular." Repeating Rakowski's theme, it then claimed that the dissolution was necessary because of Solidarity's resistance to martial law.

At the same time, *Glos Wybrzeza* maintained that the new union law was "thoroughly innovative and modern, a fully democratic and legal act."

A simple examination of the law shows just how "democratic" it really is.

At the core of the act is the bureaucracy's definition of what a trade union should be. It should represent the "occupational interests" of its members, and should concern itself solely with questions of wages, working conditions, recreation, social and medical benefits, living costs, etc.

Excluded from this definition is any participation by the trade unions in the shaping of broader social, economic, and political policies.

The bureaucracy's usual justification for this is that in a country like Poland, where capitalism has been abolished, there are no fundamental conflicts between the working class and the government, just minor "misunderstandings" resulting from "excesses" and "errors" committed by individual officials. As the argument goes, the workers' broader political, social, and economic interests are protected and advanced by the PUWP.

What this argument seeks to cover up is the obvious fact that the workers and farmers do not hold governmental power. That is controlled by the bureaucracy itself, a materially privileged social layer that safeguards its position in society by maintaining a strong repressive apparatus and a monopoly over all decision-making powers. Its policies are fundamentally anti-working-class and contradictory to the development of the progressive state property forms won by the workers through the overturn of capitalism following World War II.

During Solidarity's period of legal existence, it directly challenged the bureaucracy's conception of the role of trade unions. It pointed out that everything that happens in society affects the workers, and insisted that they have a say over government policies. "Nothing about us without us," was the favorite slogan of Lech Walesa, the union's national chairman.

Solidarity demanded full democratic rights, attacked the bureaucracy's special privileges, and fought for the establishment of workers councils to take over management of the factories and to participate in determining broader social and economic policy. Solidarity exposed the myth that the bureaucrats and their PUWP represented the interests of the workers.

This posed a major threat to the bureaucracy's political survival, and Jaruzelski's trade-union law seeks to ensure that the new unions do not try to follow in Solidarity's footsteps.

Built-in weaknesses

Various provisions of the law aim to keep the new unions extremely weak.

Unions may now be organized only around a given trade, occupation, or profession. This is in sharp contrast to Solidarity's structure, which encompassed all the workers in a given factory, city, or region within the same union body, regardless of their occupation. That structure facilitated broader and more united working-class action and enabled the workers



Demonstrators flash 'V-for-victory' signs at pro-Solidarity rally outside Lenin Shipyard in Gdansk November 1.

to speak with one voice in negotiations with the central authorities.

All prospective unions will have to be officially registered by the Warsaw Provincial Court before they can legally function. And, according to one provision of the law, "The court will refuse to register a trade union should its statutes indicate that the organization in question is not a trade union as defined by this Act or should the provisions of the statutes conflict with the provisions of this Act."

The law formally includes a point on the right to strike, but it is burdened with so many qualifications that legal strikes will in practice be virtually impossible.

First of all, a strike can be called only "to defend the economic and social interests of a given group of employees," a definition that excludes solidarity strikes by workers in other plants or industries. "Political strikes are inadmissible," the law flatly states. And the bureaucracy will decide which ones are political.

Aside from these limitations, a strike may not be called until the workers have first gone through a prolonged and complicated system of arbitration hearings. Any action by a local union must win the approval of a higher union body. Certain sectors of the workforce are denied any right to strike, including civil servants, transportation and communications employees, road maintenance workers, and television and radio employees.

Anyone organizing an illegal strike may be jailed for up to one year or fined up to 50,000 zlotys (equivalent to five months of the average wage of a worker). A union that defies the regulations of the act can be ordered to hold new leadership elections. If it still refuses to comply, it can be suspended. Its members may each be fined 50,000 zlotys.

According to the act, the individual plant-level unions cannot form a larger union or federation until after Dec. 31, 1984. This is to give the bureaucracy time to ensure that the unions do, in fact, function the way it wants them to.

One of the final points of the act is the repeal of the May 1981 Law on Trade Unions of Private Farmers — in effect, a ban on Rural Sol-

idarity, the 1.5-million-member farmers' organization that was allied to Solidarity.

Workers launch boycott

In factories around the country, the universal reaction to the new trade-union law is one of extreme hostility. Besides protesting the dissolution of the previous unions, especially Solidarity, the workers are expressing their contempt for the new unions through a widespread boycott.

Most clandestine Solidarity bodies, including the Provisional Coordinating Committee (TKK) and various local groups, have issued formal calls for such a boycott.

The TKK, in a declaration issued October 9, declared, "Since the Independent and Self-governing Trade Union Solidarity can be dissolved only by force of its members' decision, our union still exists and will continue to strive for a Self-governed Republic." It called on "union members, all working people, and all trade unions to conduct a general boycott of the fake trade unions."

The government, for its part, has launched a major campaign to promote the new unions. The official newspapers are filled with articles extolling their benefits. Every day, the television features round-table discussions, interviews, or reports on the unions.

Yet the November 5 *Trybuna Ludu*, the main PUWP daily, had to admit in a front-page article that the new unions are coming up against "many barriers and much prejudice and distrust."

To give the impression that the new unions are actually getting off the ground, the press has been focusing on the establishment of union "founding committees" around the country. Several hundred have already applied to the Warsaw Provincial Court for registration.

The authorities are seeking to portray the setting up of these committees as rank-and-file initiatives. But in many cases, the members and leaders of the committees are PUWP officials in the plants or former leaders of the dissolved branch unions. In some cases, former Solidarity members have taken part, a fact that is then blown up in the news media.

At the MSW construction enterprise in Warsaw, for example, the founding committee was

launched by three PUWP members.

At the Kasprzak radio and electronics firm, the management actually initiated the committee. The director began by calling in the plant's former Solidarity chairman and vice-chairman and the former chairman of the branch union. He asked them to establish a new union. The Solidarity members refused outright. The branch union official initially agreed, only to change his mind the next day, stating that he would not help set up the union, "because people simply don't want it, and I won't play blindman's buff for the second time in my life."

Finally, the director got 23 people to set up a committee, chaired by a PUWP leader who had personally been responsible for getting two Solidarity activists detained following the imposition of martial law.

In some of the Solidarity strongholds, the authorities have had particular problems getting even the legal minimum of 30 people to apply for official registration.

Out of 18,000 workers at the Ursus tractor factory near Warsaw, only 20 had joined by late October. Out of 40,000 at the Lenin steelworks near Krakow, just 17 had joined the founding committee there.

At the FSO automobile plant in Warsaw, which employs 17,000 workers, the authorities claimed that 19 people belonged to the committee. But only 10 have publicly admitted they did. "It's an underground founding committee," a former Solidarity adviser joked.

A Solidarity activist at the Rosa Luxemburg light bulb factory in Warsaw described the situation there in an interview in the October 20 issue of *Wiadomosci*, a clandestine Solidarity bulletin in Warsaw with a circulation of about 10,000.

"I've never seen the entire workforce take such a uniform position before," he said. "It's funny, but the most radical ones at the moment are the branch union people and some of the party members."

He also noted some of the difficulties that the workers will face in trying to maintain the boycott over a long period. Since many services — such as medical benefits, job training, financial loans, and vacations — are handled directly by the trade unions in Poland, the authorities will be able to use them to induce people to join the new unions. "They will try to blackmail the workers," he said.

In some plants, preparations have already been made to try to counteract the use of such pressures. At Huta Warszawa, the giant steelworks just outside Warsaw, Solidarity's local Provisional Executive Committee has set up a special social committee to provide assistance to boycotting workers and defend them from repression.

A former member of Solidarity's national staff here in Gdansk told me that the boycott could probably be maintained for some months, but beyond that it would become increasingly difficult. "Perhaps," he speculated, "we may have to join these new unions someday — and try to take them over."

Whatever the effectiveness of the boycott tactic, the workers of the Lenin Shipyard here, of Huta Warszawa, of Kasprzak, of FSO, and of the thousands of other factories and workplaces across the country are not likely to give up their aspirations for their own independent and democratically run trade unions.

That was a point made by Andrzej Gwiazda, one of the leaders of the 1980 Lenin Shipyard strike who has been in detention since the declaration of martial law. In an essay smuggled out of the Strzebielinek internment camp here shortly before the Sejm adopted the new union

law, Gwiazda stated:

"Many of our members may even formally sign up with these unions. But Solidarity will survive. It will survive in our memories, hearts, and aspirations. And then it is only a matter of time until it is reborn, in the full sense of the word. The delegitimation of Solidarity is not the end — it is a stage in the work of preparing for it to emerge from the underground in a form considerably stronger than before. The preservation of Solidarity's principles and ideas in its members' activities and goals — that is the guarantee of its rebirth." □

Regime frees Lech Walesa

'Solidarity' strike draws little participation

By Ernest Harsch

Eleven months after he was interned by Poland's military authorities, Lech Walesa returned home to Gdansk November 14 to a tumultuous welcome from crowds of hundreds of supporters.

The national chairman of the Solidarity union movement was greeted by chants of "Lech! Lech!" and "Solidarity! Solidarity!"

Apartment buildings around his home in the Gdansk suburb of Zaspas were decorated with Solidarity flags, banners, and slogans, despite the fact that Solidarity is now officially banned and the display of Solidarity insignia is illegal. "Solidarity lives," declared one such banner.

When Walesa pulled up in a car driven by security police, he was mobbed by supporters, some of whom had been waiting outside his home for three days. He was carried up the stairs by the jubilant crowd, flashing a V-for-victory sign.

Walesa spoke from the balcony of his apartment. Assuring his listeners that 11 months of detention had not altered his views, he declared, "I promise you that I won't leave the road and ideals that we came up with in August," referring to the August 1980 strike wave that led to the emergence of Solidarity.

"I will assuredly speak out on all matters which interest us in the very near future," he said. "I will talk and act, not on my knees, but with prudence; you can rest assured of that."

Walesa said that unity among the workers was needed now as much as during the August 1980 strike. "We must win — of that there is no doubt."

The next day, speaking to reporters, Walesa noted that he was "walking on a tightrope." If he did not watch his words, he implied, he could be reinterned.

The government's announcement that Walesa would be released came November 11, a day after a call for a countrywide general strike by Solidarity's underground leadership failed to win much support. The strike had been called to protest the government's outlawing of Solidarity.

There were protest demonstrations in some cities and partial strikes and strike attempts in

several workplaces on November 10, but the response fell far short of the organizers' expectations. There were several reasons for this:

- The government, which reacted to previous demonstration and strike calls with massive force, warned that it would use "all necessary means" to break any strikes. In factories around the country, those known as the most active Solidarity supporters were personally warned that they would be fired if strikes occurred. Some were detained. In Wroclaw, a key union stronghold, 18 underground activists were arrested, including Piotr Bednarz, a member of Solidarity's five-man Provisional Coordinating Committee.

- There were differences among Solidarity supporters over the strike call. Pointing to the government's readiness to use massive repression, many argued that the union was not sufficiently organized to carry out such an ambitious action as an eight-hour general strike.

- The hierarchy of the Catholic church, which has wide influence in Poland, came out explicitly against the strike. In response, the government announced November 8 that an agreement had been reached with the church officials for a visit to Poland by Pope John Paul II in June 1983.

But fear of being arrested or fired was the main factor that kept most workers from participating.

Nevertheless, thousands defiantly expressed their continued support for Solidarity by turning out for demonstrations in Warsaw, Wroclaw, Poznan, Nowa Huta, and other cities. Riot police attacked the protests, and some 800 people were arrested around the country. Several strike actions were reported as well.

The authorities seized on the failure of the November 10 strike to proclaim that Solidarity was finished. But they know better. Support for the union remains widespread, and the government has never been so unpopular.

That is why they have now decided to combine their repression with some concessions, to try to defuse the extremely tense political situation. But as the response to Walesa's return to Gdansk showed, that may not be so easy to accomplish. □

Setbacks for Iraqi invaders

Workers hail victories, volunteer for war front

By Fred Murphy

In fighting that began November 1, Iranian forces succeeded in regaining more than 200 square miles of territory occupied by Iraqi units since Iraq invaded Iran in September 1980.

Socialists in Tehran report that when the new victories were announced, thousands of residents of the capital's poor and working-class neighborhoods went onto their rooftops to chant slogans hailing the victories.

So many workers and government employees responded to a call for further volunteers that top officials went on television repeatedly to say that no more were needed for the war front at present.

'Fight for oppressed of world'

For the first time in many months, reporters from major U.S. dailies and wire services have been allowed to visit Iran. R.W. Apple of the *New York Times* reported November 6 on his encounter with members of the Pasdaran, or Revolutionary Guards, at the frontline village of Musian:

"They wear no insignia of rank and never salute, and they talk frequently of their willingness to be 'martyrs.' On their left breast pockets, they wear a blue and gold patch that shows a globe, an arm and an AK-47 assault rifle — a symbol, one 23-year-old explained, of their eagerness to fight overseas 'for the oppressed of the world.' He mentioned El Salvador as the kind of place where he would like to fight."

The high morale among the Iranian forces is in marked contrast to the mood in the Iraqi ranks. Iranian soldiers returning from the front report that most Iraqi infantry units surrendered with little resistance when the latest Iranian advance began. A captured Iraqi colonel interviewed on television in Tehran said that "the first thing that happened when the Iranian forces approached was that all the generals fled."

More than 2,000 Iraqi soldiers were taken prisoner in the Iranian offensive, in which several Iraqi brigades were routed from the area around the Iranian towns of Musian and Dehloran.

By routing the Iraqis and moving on to occupy some 120 square miles of Iraqi territory, the Iranian forces were able to put a stop to continued shelling of towns and highways in Iran from the heights around Musian.

In one such attack from Iraq in late October, 21 Iranians were killed and 107 injured in the city of Dezful, 62 miles east of the border. The dead were mostly women and children killed when an Iraqi ground-to-ground missile hit the

city's main shopping district.

The original aim of Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein, when he launched the invasion of Iran in September 1980, was to topple the regime of Ayatollah Khomeini and weaken the Iranian revolution. Hussein feared the impact the anti-imperialist upsurge of the Iranian people could have on the toilers of Iraq and other Arab countries. Washington and other imperialist powers shared this concern, and they welcomed the Iraqi invasion.

But the Iranian people rallied to defend their revolution. The Iraqi occupiers have now been driven from virtually all the Iranian territory that they had captured in the early weeks of the war. Hussein's own regime is growing more shaky, and Washington has been encouraging proimperialist Arab rulers like King Hussein of Jordan, Mubarak of Egypt, and the Saudi royal family to step up aid to Iraq and stave off an Iranian victory.

Economic situation

The U.S. capitalist press has in the past claimed that Iran's economic difficulties were leading it to the brink of collapse. This idea has

also been echoed by much of the radical press around the world. They have opposed Iranian troops moving into Iraq, charging that this defensive military operation is just a maneuver by the Khomeini government to divert workers' attention from economic problems at home.

But reporters for major U.S. dailies now in Iran report a different picture. They indicate that in spite of the U.S. imperialist economic blockade of Iran and the hardships of the long war with Iraq, the revolution has not been stifled.

"There is ample food for everyone," R.W. Apple reported from Tehran in the November 15 *Times*, "although many items, including such staples as cooking oil and meat, are rationed."

"Shops here are reasonably well stocked with goods," wrote Youssef M. Ibrahim in the November 9 *Wall Street Journal*. "Some foods are expensive, but Iranians aren't starving." Ibrahim even quoted a senior Western diplomat as saying, "The bulk of the people in this country are better off today than they used to be before the revolution."

Iran's oil minister announced in early November that despite the continued needs of the war effort, the rationing of home heating oil was being ended.

In the countryside, Iranian peasants have organized in village committees, or *shoras*, and have demanded land-reform legislation and credit and technical aid from the state. While

Socialists present candidates

Elections are to be held in Iran on December 10 to fill a number of vacant seats in the parliament, or *majlis*.

The Revolutionary Workers Party (HKE), one of three Iranian organizations affiliated to the Fourth International, has announced candidates for four parliamentary seats.

In Tehran the HKE is running Rezvan Rooshenas, a woman textile worker who was fired from her job last year; Farhad Keshavarz, a shoe factory worker; and Babak Zahraie, a well-known HKE spokesperson. The HKE's candidate in Rasht, a city on the Caspian Sea, is Hadi Adib, a textile worker.

As of November 11 it was not known whether the HKE's candidates would be placed on the ballot.

Meanwhile the HKE is continuing its efforts to secure the release of five supporters of the organization who have been imprisoned in various parts of Iran. Bahram Ali Atai and Mohammed Bagher Falsafi have been held without charges at Evin Prison in Tehran since last March. Hassan Sadegh, a young soldier, remains jailed in Ahwaz under a 10-year sentence for reading and distributing the HKE's weekly *Kargar*

(now banned). In Masjed-e Suleiman, the poet Morid Mirghaed has been held without charges since late July.

HKE members directly involved in the organization's defense efforts have themselves been subjected to official harassment in recent weeks. Several have been arrested, held for a few hours or days, and then released. One, Shanaz Dilmaghani, is still being held. No charges against Dilmaghani have been made public.

Those who support the Iranian revolution and oppose imperialism's attacks against it are urged to help secure the release of these HKE members and supporters. Telegrams in behalf of Atai, Falsafi, and Dilmaghani should be sent to Hojatoislam Mousavi Tabrizi, Prosecutor General, Islamic Revolutionary Courts, Tehran, Iran.

Messages calling for the release of Morid Mirghaed should be sent to the Islamic Revolutionary Courts, Masjed-e Suleiman, Iran, and those calling for the release of Hassan Sadegh should be sent to the Army Islamic Revolutionary Courts, Ahwaz, Iran.

Copies of all telegrams should be sent to the newspaper *Kayhan*, Kouche Atabak, Ferdowsi Avenue, Tehran, Iran.

the land-reform law remains stalled in parliament, considerable aid has been distributed. Ibrahim's report in the November 9 *Wall Street Journal* says that fertilizer has been "given free of charge to farmers since the current regime came to power," and that its use has increased 76 percent over the past five years. "Tractors, also given free to farmers, have increased by 52 percent, government officials say."

In many areas, peasants have seized idle holdings from landlords without waiting for the land-reform law. With more land in production, harvests of grain, rice, and fruit are considerably larger this year.

The peasant movement scored an important victory in late October when the parliament passed a law legally authorizing the formation of village shoras. The Tehran press now reports that such bodies have been set up in 20,000 of Iran's 70,000 villages.



Iranian peasants.

That advance will encourage urban workers to pursue their fight to gain such legal recognition of factory and workplace shoras. Social-

ists in Iran report that seminars, or conferences, of shora representatives have been held in recent weeks in a number of industrial areas of Tehran.

These meetings have been extensively reported in the major newspapers for the first time. They have discussed the labor law now being drawn up by the authorities and have demanded that the workers be fully involved in its preparation. In particular, workers are demanding that Article 33 of the shah's labor law, which is still in force, be eliminated. That article authorizes arbitrary firings by management.

In some of the shora seminars, workers have sharply criticized the regime's Labor Ministry. When a ministry official appeared at one meeting, the workers told him that the ministry should be disbanded and its building converted into a hospital for war invalids. □

Grenada

Terrorists sentenced in bomb plot

Death penalty imposed for attack that killed three

Following a two-week trial in St. George's, Grenada, four people were found guilty of a terrorist bombing in 1980 in which three young women were killed. On November 1, the four were sentenced to death.

The bombing took place at Queen's Park on June 19, 1980, during a rally of several thousand people. Virtually the entire top leadership of the People's Revolutionary Government and the revolutionary New Jewel Movement was present to address the rally. On the speakers' platform were Prime Minister Maurice Bishop, Deputy Prime Minister Bernard Coard, and others.

The bomb had been placed directly under the platform. Equipped with a timing device, it was detonated precisely at 3:00 p.m.

Although those on the concrete platform escaped unhurt, the blast hit the crowd. Three young women — aged 13, 15, and 23 years old — were killed. Dozens of others were wounded.

Speaking later that day over Radio Free Grenada, Prime Minister Bishop charged that the terrorist action was the work of "imperialism and its local agents."

Those who carried out the bombing were eventually tracked down and arrested. Five in all were charged: Russel, Kenneth, and Roland Budhlall, Grace Augustine, and Layne Phillip. Of the five, Roland Budhlall was found not guilty and released.

The Budhlall brothers in particular had been previously linked to counterrevolutionary activities. Just a week before the bombing, hundreds of rounds of ammunition had been found in the home of Russel Budhlall. The govern-

ment had also pointed to ties between these counterrevolutionaries and the U.S. CIA.

Despite attempts by Washington and its allies in the region to paint the Grenadian government as repressive, the defendants were given ample opportunity during the trial to defend themselves. Against the prosecution's three lawyers, the defense had seven, including five who came to Grenada from Jamaica and Trinidad to participate in the trial. An observer from Amnesty International was also present during the proceedings.

Judge Satrohan Singh heard some 25 differ-

ent witnesses give testimony, some of whom described conversations with the defendants before and after the bombing and the steps they took to place the bomb.

In his ruling, Judge Singh took up some of the questions that have been raised about the legal system in Grenada. According to a summary of his remarks in the November 3 *Free West Indian*, the judge — who is not originally from Grenada — "said that there was never any attempt to interfere with the judiciary during his two years in Grenada, and expressed confidence that the rule of law was secure." □



Mass rally in Grenada.

Jerry Hunnicutt/IP

Public employees stage one-day general strike

Fight government demands for huge givebacks

[The following article is based on a report from Jeanne André from Montreal and on an article by Michel Prairie that appeared in the November 8 issues of *Lutte Ouvrière* and *Socialist Voice*, the French- and English-language biweeklies of the Revolutionary Workers League of Canada.]

* * *

Hundreds of thousands of Quebec public sector workers went on a 24-hour strike November 10. They were saying "no" to the enormous takebacks demanded by their employer, the Quebec government.

Defying injunctions brought against them by the government and the Montreal Transit Commission, the public sector workers and members of the Montreal transit union (maintenance) paralyzed the entire education system and about half of Quebec's health care facilities. The Montreal transit system was also tied up.

Faced with offers that would "take us back 20 years," the strikers — a majority women — made up an impressive demonstration of power, determination, and solidarity. Their action was the first response by Quebec workers to Prime Minister Elliot Trudeau's two-year public-sector wage freeze. In June the federal government announced that wage increases in the next year would be limited to 6 percent and to 5 percent in the following year. With inflation running nearly 12 percent, this measure represents a big cut in real wages.

The protest strike was a resounding rejection of the Quebec government's offer, which in addition to demanding the wage cut, attacks job security and demands an increased work load. This proposal, if implemented, would also lead to a deepening of the oppression suffered by women in Quebec.

"This action is a warning; it could be the first stage in an extremely important struggle," said Yvon Charbonneau, president of the Quebec teachers federation. He was addressing some 9,000 striking teachers on the lawn of Quebec's national assembly in Quebec City. The leadership of the Common Front — the coalition of unions in the public sector — has been authorized by its members to call an unlimited general strike if necessary.

"We have a golden opportunity to wage a common struggle with the public and parapublic sector workers to get rid of Law 72," declared Jacques Morrissette, president of the Montreal transit union. Law 72, adopted by René Lévesque's Parti Québécois (PQ) government in Quebec, more or less eliminates the right to strike in hospitals, schools, and public transportation under the pretext of maintaining "essential services."

Morrissette urged his members to defy the court order prohibiting them from striking. "More than ever we must unite and strike together." The 2,050 maintenance unionists are the only workers employed by the Montreal Transit Commission who have not signed an agreement with the commission. The motion to defy the law was adopted by a large majority.

The strike is important for workers throughout Canada. The Quebec public sector workers face takebacks of millions of dollars in wages and the threat of fines of up to \$100 per worker, \$50,000 for the union, and \$10,000



Public-sector workers say: "No to the PQ budget, Jobs for all!"

and/or imprisonment for union leaders. But they are holding firm.

Foreign domination of Quebec — directly by the Canadian imperialist government in Ottawa, as well as by other imperialist interests — underlies the Lévesque government's attempts to impose an austerity policy on its 330,000 employees.

Workers in Quebec, like others in Canada, are targets of Prime Minister Trudeau's attempt, together with Canadian employers, to impose the two-year wage ceiling of 6 percent and 5 percent.

The federal government has also cut \$685 million in transfer payments to Quebec.

In addition, both U.S. and Canadian banks are insisting that Quebec hold its provincial budgetary deficit to \$3 billion. The bankers warn if this target is not met, they will impose much higher interest rates and harsher repay-

ment conditions on future borrowing.

The Parti Québécois has folded completely under the pressure from Ottawa and the international bankers. Along with the attacks against the wages and working conditions of public-sector workers, there have been increases in the sales tax, in taxes on alcohol, tobacco, and gasoline, and cuts in social services.

The Parti Québécois has attempted to justify its policies by telling working people in Quebec that it has no choice but to impose these measures. It claims that if Quebec does not radically cut its expenses, it faces an economic disaster.

But the PQ's economic policy has two sides. While the PQ has been attacking workers' living standards, it is generously subsidizing big business and the multinationals.

Today, for example, Quebec corporations enjoy the best tax shelters in all of Canada. Quebec Finance Minister Jacques Parizeau acknowledged that this represents a gift of \$715 million to the corporations in 1982 alone.

But the defiant one-day strike of the public-sector workers, like that of the striking Chrysler workers in Ontario, is a powerful declaration that working people are prepared to defend their living standards and their rights; and not just in good times, but also in times of economic hardship.

The maintenance workers' action in joining the strike is of particular importance. Their union was the only one of three transit unions to turn down a concession contract with the Montreal Transit Commission this year. Maintenance workers are determined to negotiate a contract that includes neither takebacks of already won benefits, nor any wage cuts.

The maintenance workers have strengthened their own position by joining forces with the Common Front. And they've strengthened the Common Front as a whole. That was clearly shown when their action paralyzed public transit in Montreal November 10 and thereby increased the pressure on the government.

Such unity will be very important in the event of a general strike.

Government repression before and during the strike is only a small foretaste of what the unions that have defied the injunction can expect. Quebec Justice Minister Marc André-Bédard has already publicly stressed that the labor code will be applied "rigorously and fully and that under the circumstances any work stoppage will bring application of the penalties provided for in the code." The maintenance union has already been told to appear in court on December 13. □

Cuba and its island neighbors

Interviews with Carlos Rafael Rodríguez, Ricardo Alarcón

[The following interviews with Cuban leaders Carlos Rafael Rodríguez and Ricardo Alarcón appeared in the November issue of *Caribbean Contact*, a monthly newspaper published in Barbados. The interviews were conducted by *Contact* editor Rickey Singh.]

* * *

How serious is Havana about pursuing mutually satisfactory relations with this region? Why the military build-up in Cuba? Why has the Castro Government been so reluctant in endorsing the growing call by CARICOM governments, for instance, that the Caribbean be declared a "Zone of Peace"? Is there really a "special relationship" with Grenada, as reportedly was the case with Michael Manley's Government in Jamaica even prior to the overthrow of the Gairy regime in Grenada in March 1979?

Carlos Rafael Rodríguez, Vice-President of the Council of State and one of the better known spokespersons for the Cuban Communist Party on international affairs, and Ricardo Alarcón, Deputy Foreign Minister and the first Cuban to have been accredited as his country's diplomatic representative to independent CARICOM countries, were both in an expansive mood as they spoke, separately, to *Contact* last month in Havana:

"Let there be no misunderstandings about our desire to have the best of relations with all Caribbean countries," declared Rodríguez. "We are a Caribbean country with no hegemonic designs and with no illusions about multiplying the Cuban revolution. We are not in the business of exporting revolution. This is a figment of American foreign policy which cannot, 23 years after our revolution, bring itself to behave rationally towards Cuba. Was the American revolution exported to France? No, the conditions existed in France for what the world remembers as the historic French revolution."

Accepting as he said, "the implications of ideological pluralism, the difference in systems of government in the region, also variations in foreign policy objectives," Rodríguez, behind whose desk hang two huge portraits of Che Guevara and the Nicaraguan revolutionary, Augusto Sandino, emphatically blamed the United States for "whatever problems" may exist among some CARICOM countries in their relations with Cuba.

"When we speak of Latin America and the Caribbean, we think of the people of one region, plundered for years by American imperialism. Now, in the post-Malvinas situation, when some Latin American countries are openly expressing their resentment against the

positions taken by countries of the English-speaking Caribbean that chose to identify themselves with the British and American initiatives during the war over the Malvinas, Cuba remains firmly opposed to any initiative that may further aggravate relations or sow discord among Latin American and Caribbean governments and peoples.

"Cuba is not interested in the formation of any Latin American group that will exclude the Caribbean countries. We are not interested in the Organization of American States, which is dominated by the USA and which thinks of and behaves as if the OAS is a Ministry of American Colonies. We are keen on an association of Latin American and Caribbean States that authentically represents our America."

But what of the allegations of Cuban interventionist politics in Central America and the Caribbean, and of Havana's menacing military profile, as presented by the USA?

"Nobody can justifiably accuse Cuba of intervention in the area," replied Mr. Rodríguez. "On the contrary, the US has a long history of interventions in this region. Right now our own security is being threatened by the United States. Only recently Congress approved the dangerous and highly provocative Symms Amendment [named after Republican Senator

Steven D. Symms] to empower the Presidency to resort to all means available, including the use of troops, to oppose what they have unilaterally declared to be the Cuban threat in this hemisphere."

Rodríguez said Cuba was co-operating with Nicaragua and Grenada "because they have asked for our assistance and we will continue co-operating with these countries so long as they need our help. We have been giving our support to the forces of democratic resistance in El Salvador. The nature of that assistance has been considerably misrepresented, as has been our co-operation with Nicaragua and Grenada. We have no kind of relations with either Nicaragua or Grenada that poses a security problem for their neighbours.

"Let me make one thing quite clear: The threat to peace and security in this region comes not from Cuba, but from the United States. Cuba is prepared to give whatever guarantees may be necessary and sensible that its military capabilities, its armed forces, will never be used for aggressive purposes against any Latin American or Caribbean country.

"Our military forces are not here to attack any of these countries or even to defend us from invasions from any Latin American na-



tion, for we do not seriously expect any such attacks. But we do expect the United States to try something foolish, perhaps on a larger and more menacing scale than they did at the Bay of Pigs.

"Our armies are here to prevent such an invasion of our country and to make it clear to the Americans that the cost they will have to pay in lives for invading Cuba will be so high that maybe they will not be willing to come. That is the reason for our military build-up, as you put it earlier. We want to live in peace with our neighbours and with the USA. But the Reagan Government does not want to have a sensible relationship with us."

On the "Zone of Peace" issue, Rodríguez

contends that while Cuba was in favour of the idea, it would be impractical for his Government to call for its creation without first resolving "some basic questions," the primary one being the security threat the US poses to the sovereignty of all the countries in this hemisphere. An end to colonialism and foreign military bases are also considerations in determining the area as a "Zone of Peace."

"We cannot, for instance," said Rodríguez, "enter into a 'Zone of Peace' agreement while the major world power in this area, the United States, continues to use our waters and our lands to parade its military strength to intimidate us and to use its proxies and mercenaries to destabilise Latin American and Caribbean

governments to which the White House is opposed."

Today, after the Malvinas fiasco, a number of Latin American countries were seriously reviewing the Rio Treaty, which they now realise, he said, that the US was interested in invoking only when its own interests are at stake.

In this context, he welcomed what he described as "helpful attitudes" being demonstrated by even the Government of [Luis] Herrera Campins in Venezuela, which is seeking to normalise its relations with Cuba.

Cuba, he said, was also particularly appreciative of the efforts being made by Mexico

Grenada answers charges at CARICOM summit

At a November 16 news conference shortly after the opening of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) summit conference in Jamaica, Grenadian Prime Minister Maurice Bishop condemned the efforts of several Caribbean governments to achieve "the isolation of Grenada."

The campaign, he said, was inspired by external forces, clearly referring to the U.S. government.

The conference had been preceded by weeks of a vicious slander campaign in the regional press attacking alleged human rights violations in Grenada and Grenada's close relations with Cuba. On November 15, full-page ads in five Caribbean newspapers criticized "self-proclaimed Prime Minister Bishop" for the "alarming state of human rights."

As a propaganda ploy, Barbadian Prime Minister Tom Adams recently proposed that the CARICOM charter be rewritten to include a plank committing its members to "parliamentary democracy." This was backed by Prime Minister Edward Seaga of Jamaica, who, in an obvious reference to Grenada, charged that there had appeared within the 12-member CARICOM "something called people's democracy and this was the Cuban model which we reject."

Adams's charter proposal was raised at the CARICOM summit itself, which was the first time the English-speaking Caribbean heads of state had met in seven years. (The members of the CARICOM are: Antigua, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, and Trinidad and Tobago.)

In his answer to this campaign, Bishop said that the revolution in Grenada "did not take place for the calling of elections, but for food, for bread, for justice, for housing — to insure that the people for the first time would have the right to participate."

He said it was a "sham" to think that giving people "five seconds every five years" to vote was democratic. "Westminster-style democracy is parliamentary hypocrisy," he said.

Bishop also challenged the CARICOM to conduct a country-by-country poll, to interview people about what they thought on political rights and social and economic rights, and to publish the results.

When the CARICOM conference ended three days later, the effort to write Grenada out of the organization had failed. The final documents did not include Adams's proposal on including a plank on "parliamentary democracy."

This campaign against Grenada was similar to the earlier one inspired by Washington to isolate Cuba in the region.

When CARICOM was formed in 1973, Cuba had almost no diplomatic or economic ties with the English-speaking Caribbean, thanks to the U.S. blockade. But by the middle of the decade an important crack in the blockade had been opened. The governments of Guyana, Jamaica, Barbados, and Trinidad and Tobago defied Washington and established diplomatic relations with Cuba.

Economic ties between Cuba and some CARICOM members were also established. Cuba provided assistance to several countries. Doctors and teachers were sent to Guyana. Especially close relations were established with Jamaica under the government of Michael Manley's People's National Party (PNP). Between 1976 and 1980, Cuban doctors treated more than 1 million patients in Jamaica, and Cuban construction brigades built schools, sports centers, and dams.

Cuba has also provided scholarships to students from other islands. These have sometimes been provided directly to political organizations.

Cuba's influence and stature in the reg-

ion have grown particularly since 1979, when revolutions triumphed in Grenada and Nicaragua. The extension of the socialist revolution to two more countries in the region accelerated class polarization, as the working classes and ruling classes alike responded to the emergence of what Cuban President Fidel Castro called the "three giants in the Caribbean."

The new government in Grenada quickly established diplomatic relations with Cuba and appealed for Cuban technical and economic assistance. Cuban workers have been playing a major role in building a new international airport in Grenada, which is crucial for the expansion of the island's tourist industry. Cuban doctors have helped bolster Grenada's medical services.

In response to the revolutions in Grenada and Nicaragua, the U.S. imperialists went on an offensive in the region, including blackmail attempts against Grenada, backing counterrevolutionary terrorist forces in Nicaragua, and threatening military intervention against Cuba.

In 1980 — following a prolonged U.S. campaign of destabilization — the PNP lost the elections in Jamaica and Seaga's pro-imperialist Jamaica Labour Party (JLP) came to power. One of its first acts was to break diplomatic ties with Cuba and end Cuba's various economic assistance programs in the country. Pro-U.S. regimes were also brought to power in Dominica and St. Lucia, and the relations between those countries and Cuba have cooled.

As the CARICOM conference has shown, Washington has now also stepped up its efforts to isolate Grenada. But while the pro-imperialist regimes in the Caribbean have been escalating their attacks on Grenada, so too has the example of the Grenada revolution been attracting more and more attention among working people throughout the region.

— Ernest Harsch

to promote peace in Central America and Caribbean States.

But what about "normalising" relations with Jamaica and promoting better understanding with CARICOM countries, for example on the issue of Cuba's scholarship offers to the region?

Deputy Foreign Minister Alarcón, who made a tour of a number of CARICOM countries a year ago last month in the wake of Jamaica's break in diplomatic ties with Havana, said that the region's media was being used by forces hostile to Cuba to misrepresent the state of relations between his country and the Caribbean Community.

"We are a Caribbean country and the Caribbean is a fundamental priority of our foreign policy," declared Alarcón. "With the exception of Jamaica we face no problems in our relations with these countries which have established diplomatic links with us."

He said that "there has been some confusion over Cuban scholarships. Cuba does not offer scholarships *against* governments. We offer scholarships to benefit countries; scholarships in the fields of health, education, economics, engineering, etc. If we offer governments scholarships and they do not wish to accept them, and fraternal organisations in these countries seek such assistance, we offer them."

"We do not give scholarships to overthrow Caribbean governments. This is a foolish notion. Some governments have now asked that we first inform them about scholarship offers before they are granted to their nationals. We have no objections to such requests, for we do not wish to antagonise fellow Caribbean Governments."

However, like Rodríguez earlier, Alarcón pointed out that while a lot of propaganda was being made about Cuban scholarship offers, the USA and her allies were being left free, not merely to offer scholarships and travel grants as they choose, but to undermine the sovereignty of Caribbean nations.

Alarcón said that from his private conversations with representatives of CARICOM governments, he was convinced that they would like to maintain friendly relations with Cuba.

In the case of Jamaica, he said, once the [Edward] Seaga Government was prepared to restore normal relations with Cuba, the Cuban Government would do everything possible to ensure proper understanding between the two countries. "But," he added, "we will not lose sleep if Seaga decides that he does not want to renew diplomatic relations with Cuba."

Alarcón said that since much was being reported about "special relationships" between Cuba and some countries in this region he wished to cite two examples to underscore how "principled" his country was in dealing with sovereign nations:

The first example has to do with Nicaragua. When Nicaragua was devastated by a terrible earthquake [in 1972] while Somoza was still president, Cuba offered assistance — food, medicine, clothing, water, the kind of supplies urgently needed at the time.

"Somoza was grateful for Cuba's help. But we did it not for Somoza but for the suffering Nicaraguan people.

"Can you imagine what the presence of Cuban personnel in Nicaragua meant at that time, when a war of liberation was being fought by Nicaraguans against the Somoza dictatorship? We were not friendly to Somoza, neither was he friendly to us.



CARLOS RAFAEL RODRÍGUEZ

"Then, there is the case of Jamaica, our neighbour, a country historically very close to us, even before either country became independent. It was a JLP Government that had established Consular relations with Cuba. When Michael Manley's PNP came to power, Jamaica-Cuba relations were significantly improved, developing into specific areas of co-operation in the fields of public health, education, construction and culture.

"In the midst of serious economic problems being faced by the Manley Government, we offered a line of credit to Jamaica. Edward Seaga, during the election campaign of 1980, made no secret of his disagreements with Cuba. When he came to power he requested the recall of our Ambassador in Kingston.

"Surprisingly, just a few weeks before he broke diplomatic relations with Cuba, Seaga requested that we renew and extend the line of credit to Jamaica that was originally established with the Manley Government. We agreed.

"I think that nobody would reasonably assume that that co-operation implied ideological commitments with the JLP Government or that it affected in any way the Jamaican people's solidarity with the Cuban people.

"So, there are the examples of Nicaragua under Somoza and Jamaica under Seaga. Examples of how it is possible to have co-oper-

ation despite political differences between two countries. But Seaga chose to break relations."

Alarcón said that he did not think that this rupture in Jamaica-Cuba relations "will last forever. We have too much in common, perhaps more in common than with a number of other Caribbean countries. There's a long history of communication and exchanging between the peoples of our two countries. . . ."

And what of your relations with that other CARICOM member which the US says is a "Cuban proxy"?

"We have excellent relations with the Government and people of Grenada. Grenada is nobody's proxy. We are engaged in helping the Grenada Government to develop a number of projects in the interest of Grenada. We are not a rich country but we are providing whatever help is possible.

"The main project in which we are involved is in the construction of the new airport at Point Salines. This will greatly boost the island's tourist industry. But the United States has arrogantly and most mischievously decided to treat the airport project as having a military component. It is lying even about the airstrip and parking facilities, which are no different than those in a number of Caribbean countries. This airport is of no strategic significance to Cuba.

"The US will not, however, succeed in weakening our resolve to provide Grenada with the necessary assistance for this and other projects as the Grenadians pursue their own development."

Both Rodríguez and Alarcón said that they would welcome initiatives for the peaceful resolution of territorial conflicts among Latin American and Caribbean countries, for example those between Guatemala and Belize and Guyana and Venezuela. The peace and security of the region would be enhanced with an end to territorial conflict.

"In the meanwhile," said Rodríguez, "let us, Cuba, the CARICOM countries, all interested parties, strive to promote better Latin American-Caribbean understanding at a time when we sense a certain distancing between the Commonwealth Caribbean and Latin American countries. We are willing to work to remove misunderstandings." □

Intercontinental Press. Subscribe Today.

YES! I want to subscribe. Enclosed is \$25 for a one-year subscription; \$12.50 for six months; \$6.25 for a three-month introductory subscription.

Name

Address

City/State/Postal Zone

See business information inside front cover for overseas rates.

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

Art in a revolutionary society

A debate in pages of 'Barricada,' 'El Nuevo Diario'

By Jane Harris

MANAGUA — "Empty. Dehumanizing. Dehumanizing because the presence of man (especially now when we are constructing a new man) does not exist."

That's how Rudolf Wedel, a staff photographer for *Barricada*, reviewed an exposition of Claudia Gordillo's photographs here in the FSLN daily August 22.

Two-thirds of the photographs displayed in the exhibition depicted the earthquake-shattered cathedral of Managua from different angles and perspectives.

More than a review, Wedel's critique opened a public debate here on art and the responsibilities of the artist in a revolutionary society. Should artists concern themselves solely with themes of direct and immediate political importance in their creations? Should their work conform to some prescribed artistic policy? Or should freedom of artistic expression be encouraged?

The exchange of views on these questions began one week after the publication of Wedel's review. Gioconda Belli, one of Nicaragua's best-known poets, took exception to Wedel's assessment in a reply printed on *Barricada's* editorial page.

Besides her personal appreciation of Gordillo's photographs (highly positive), Belli drew together some general points in defense of artistic freedom.

"There are those who think that for art to be revolutionary it must be explicit, explanatory," she wrote. "They begin from the point of view that the people — whom they view almost as schoolchildren — are incapable of perceiving certain sorts of things."

Wedel's review had complained that Gordillo's photographs spoke only about her own inner world, nothing else. Belli replied, "The revolution does not deny, in any way, a person's inner world. . . . Every person who creates does so from their inner world, from impressions, personal experiences, and feelings that have their origin in the individual's existence inside society."

"The inner world does not arise out of nothing," she continued. "It is the product of social being, and cannot be said to be something that 'concerns one's self alone.' That would be to say that the essence, the center of individual people — the interior world — is isolated from the rest of society and is of no importance to anyone. Besides, all the fine art of this world is born from the inner world of the artist, which in turn is the product of her or his existence within a particular society."

For Belli, Gordillo's photographs were say-



A photograph from the exposition of Claudia Gordillo's work, showing a view of the Managua cathedral.

ing something. They "show a temple that was a symbol and point of reference of the old Managua being slowly devoured by time. . . . The dove, a symbol of peace and life, is dead; everything that encloses this great building is crumbling away."

"If that doesn't say anything to Compañero Wedel," Belli said, "it's not a problem of exposition. Because what said nothing to him said things to many others that were very profound."

The exchange did not stop there. It continued for several days on *Barricada's* editorial page and in the pages of *El Nuevo Diario* (an independent daily that supports the revolution).

The following are but a few comments from several different artists who participated in the debate:

Art is "the expression of the deepest feelings of human beings, created through their personal experiences and dreams," said poet and author Margaret Randall.

"Every creative expression must be a political expression," argued Daniel Véliz Gudiel, in support of Wedel.

"Revolutionary art doesn't have to limit it-

self to the most obvious aspects of revolutionary change, such as aspects of defense and production," Belli added, a few days after her first article. "Rather it is free to enter all terrains, including the most intimate of the artist, who — like any worker — is a social being affected by revolutionary changes."

After a week's time, the debate moved from the editorial pages to the weekly cultural magazines of the two dailies.

Onofre Guevara, *Barricada's* editorial page director and a representative of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in the Council of State, reviewed the week's debate and came down firmly on the side of artistic freedom.

He first pointed out, "This experience has indicated to us that the opening of 'internal' discussions, among revolutionaries, has been positive." (All participants in the debate are active in the work of the revolution. In fact, Gordillo has recently joined Wedel as one of *Barricada's* photographers.)

In Nicaragua, Guevara continued, "There isn't a single reason to justify worry or fear on the part of any creator for doing their work as they please, for there is no danger threatening their freedom as an artist."

"What really threatens the freedom to live in peace here — the first of human freedoms — is imperialist aggression, which our entire nation suffers from."

Commander Carlos Núñez, president of the Council of State and head of the FSLN's Department of Political Education and Propaganda (DEPEP), reaffirmed this view in an interview with *El Nuevo Diario* August 29.

"We are not partisans of recipes," Núñez said, "nor do we try to say what should be done in art, much less how it should be done. We believe that artists should create without dogmas or schemas, with the palette in one hand and the rifle in the other. Only in this way can they defend the freedom the revolution has won."

"In presenting their own art — authentically Nicaraguan, as well as universal — to the world, our artists will be projecting the image of this revolution and will be defending it against the distortions and lies of our enemies." □

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.

Jury frees IRA supporters

British government dismayed by 'not guilty' verdict

By Will Reissner

Five Irish-Americans, some of whom had admitted supplying weapons to the Irish Republican Army (IRA), were found not guilty on gun-running charges November 5 after a six-week Federal Court trial in New York City.

The jury's verdict was greeted by cheers, whistling, and shouts of "Up the IRA" in the packed courtroom.

But in London, the British government was stunned by the acquittal. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was so dismayed by the verdict that she sent Secretary of State for Northern Ireland James Prior on a week-long trip to the United States. Prior's job, according to a British official, was to explain "the gravity with which the government views support in the U.S. for the IRA."

The jury's verdict was an indication of the profound impact on American public opinion of the death of 10 hunger strikers last year in Northern Ireland.

During the jury selection process, each prospective juror was asked "Do you have an opinion with respect to Bobby Sands?" Sands was the first hunger striker to die in the protest last year.

Virtually every juror knew of Sands and the hunger strike, and many responded that he died for what he believed in.

The five defendants were charged with conspiring between December 1980 and June 1981 to transport weapons to the IRA for use in its fight to end British rule in Northern Ireland. Three were also charged with possession of quantities of unregistered firearms. Defendant George Harrison had purchased some of these weapons from an undercover agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's International Terrorism Squad.

As many as 50 FBI agents were involved in setting up the arrest of the defendants. The operation involved use of informers and undercover agents, telephone wiretaps, body microphones, and surveillance of defendants' homes.

Proud of supplying arms

In an opening statement, defense attorney Frank Durkan stated that George Harrison has "supplied arms to the rebels in Ireland for a quarter century" and "asserts it with pride."

Other defendants used their opening statements to explain how they became involved in the struggle to free Ireland from British rule. Eighty-year-old Martin Flannery, a director of Irish Northern Aid, which raises funds for the families of imprisoned freedom fighters in Northern Ireland, explained that he had been a

member of the IRA since the age of 14. Flannery was in the IRA's North Tipperary Brigade at the time of the 1916 Easter Rising against British rule. He cataloged his arrests and torture at the hands of the British army for his participation in the struggle for a free and united Ireland.

Flannery admitted providing Harrison with the nearly \$17,000 used in the purchase of weapons from an undercover FBI agent in June 1981. This amount, he stated, was far more than was usually available because fundraising had become easier due to increased sympathy generated by the hunger strike then taking place.

'Bloody Sunday' recalled

Defendant Patrick Mullin told the jury that his initial political involvement came in the late 1960s when he raised funds for the Civil Rights movement that was then organizing against the discrimination suffered by the Catholic population in Northern Ireland.

Mullin explained that when British troops opened fire on unarmed civil-rights demonstrators in Derry on "Bloody Sunday" in 1972, killing 13 marchers, "I resolved then to do everything possible to help the Irish people win their freedom."

The defense also called character witnesses such as Bernadette Devlin McAliskey, a prominent figure in the Irish freedom struggle; and David Ndaba, a representative of the African National Congress of South Africa.

Defense attorneys argued that U.S. authorities had known for decades that Harrison was shipping arms to the IRA, but set up the defendants for arrest in 1981 following pressure from the British government.

Attorney Durkan maintained that the defendants' problems began after protests forced the State Department in July 1979 to stop licensing sales of U.S.-made weapons to the British police — in Northern Ireland the Royal Ulster Constabulary.

When London complained about this decision, argued Durkan, Washington decided to prosecute these defendants to appease the British government.



From left: Daniel Gormley, Patrick Mullin, Martin Flannery, Thomas Falvey, George Harrison.

Key to the defense's argument was its claim that arms dealer George DeMeo, who sold weapons to two of the defendants for decades and who introduced them to the FBI undercover agent, had been involved in numerous CIA-sponsored arms shipments to various countries, and that therefore the government must have known of the defendants' activities.

The defense also contended that the defendants had reason to assume that DeMeo's arms sales had government approval, since he continued to sell guns with a federal license even though he was arrested five times during the period of his dealings with them.

Throughout the trial the government and DeMeo himself denied any connection between DeMeo and the CIA. The defense, however, was able to point to FBI documents indicating that on several occasions that agency had investigated possible ties between DeMeo and the CIA.

Defense lawyers also called retired CIA agent Ralph McGehee, a 25-year veteran of covert operations, to testify that it was "plausible" that the CIA might supply some arms to the IRA in order to be able to monitor and control the number and quality of weapons it was getting, and to keep it from going to other sources.

FBI ties with foreign police

In the course of the trial the FBI admitted that it had regular contact with foreign police agencies such as the Royal Ulster Constabulary and Scotland Yard. But materials pertaining to British government involvement in the prosecution's efforts were sealed by the court.

In his closing argument, prosecutor David Kirby maintained that defense attempts to bring the CIA into the case were "a fabrication." He asserted that "there's no CIA involvement in this at all. . . . Each of these defendants has been caught red-handed. They don't have anywhere else to turn."

Although the defense never did present proof of CIA involvement, the jury gave the defendants the benefit of the doubt. Said juror Lorraine Piccinonno: "I'm sure that there are many covert deals, which the people do not know about. The CIA does many things in many places."

The November 13 issue of the British financial weekly *The Economist* bemoaned the fact that defense "tactics turned what should have been a cut-and-dried affair into a political trial."

Several British newspapers deliberately misread the results of the trial, attributing the verdict to the Irish-American community. The November 9 *Yorkshire Post*, for example, said that "for historical reasons, anti-British sentiment is firmly ingrained in the Irish-American way of life."

But the jury that acquitted the defendants had few Irish-Americans among its members. Rather it was a cross-section of New Yorkers who had been convinced of the justice of the cause of Irish freedom. □

War and revolution in Iran

Interview with HKS leader

[Over the past two years, we have run several major documents by two of the organizations in Iran affiliated with the Fourth International — the Revolutionary Workers Party (HKE) and the Workers Unity Party (HVK).* Below we are publishing an interview with Saber Nikbeen, a leader of a third Iranian organization affiliated with the Fourth International, the Socialist Workers Party (HKS). The interview was conducted in mid-October in London by Gerry Foley and was initially run in the November 1 issue of the Paris magazine *International Viewpoint*.]

* * *

Question: What does the HKS think that the Iran-Iraq war has represented politically? What were the political motivations behind it and what has it represented for the Iranian revolution?

Answer: The war between the Baathist regime of Saddam Hussein and the Iranian regime dominated by Khomeini and the forces around him has now entered its third year. Over the past two years, the character of the war and hence the attitude of the workers and oppressed masses toward it has undergone considerable changes.

These changes have followed the evolution of the decisive political factors in Iran, that is, the stage of development of the Iranian revolution and process of rebuilding the bourgeois state after the old state apparatus was broken up by the mass upsurge and insurrection in 1978-79.

The most obvious change in the war is that while it was begun by an invasion of the Iraqi army, Saddam has now had to withdraw his forces back across the "international border" and it is Khomeini's soldiers that are being sent on massive offensives inside Iraq.

Unless the changes in the circumstances of the war are taken into account, one could easily fall prey to mistaken and simplistic ideas, into thinking that the present aims of the two regimes are simply a continuation of the earlier ones. It would be wrong, for example, to accept the claims of the Iranian regime that it is still waging the "same old defensive war," only now inside the Iraqi border.

The Iraqi population certainly cannot believe this, when the Iranian press and government raised the cry around the last offensive that the "Islamic fighters" were within 100 kilometers of Baghdad (actually, that is about

how far the Iraqi capital is from the Iranian border at the nearest point), or when the Iranian government proclaims that its prime intention is to liberate the Shiite holy cities of Nejaf and Kerbala in southern Iraq. In fact the headquarters of the Iranian invasion force is called "Nejaf Base."

There is no doubt now, if there ever was, that Saddam began this war with the tacit support of the reactionary Arab states and world imperialism in order to weaken the Iranian revolution and to diminish the threats it was posing against the interests of reaction in the Middle East.

Therefore, revolutionary Marxists could not take a neutral position. The war was not simply a war between two reactionary bourgeois states. It offered the opportunity for reactionary forces to strangle the Iranian revolution. And — this must be understood clearly — it was not just aimed at crushing the Iranian revolution from without, but at changing the balance of forces within the country in favor of reaction, including the reaction enconced in the Khomeini government.

Wars represent vast social, political, and economic turmoil; they are not some sort of giant football game. There is usually a certain complicity between bourgeois regimes at war, that is, complicity against their respective working classes and oppressed population. It is very rare for bourgeois regimes to try to destroy the bourgeois social formation in another country; they usually have the idea of coming to terms with it at some point.

To assume that the Khomeini regime wanted to destroy the Saddam regime root and branch, for example, one would have to assume that the Khomeini government actually wanted to spread a revolutionary upsurge through the region, when in fact its objective, as in the case of any bourgeois regime in a situation of such crisis, is to liquidate the upsurge in its own country, not to spread it. While it has tried to use the mass discontent in Iraq against Saddam to some extent, it has been very careful not to encourage a mass upsurge that could go out of control.

The opposite side of this coin is the determination of the Khomeini government to take advantage of the blows dealt to the Iranian revolution by the Iraqi invasion to strengthen its hold on the situation in its own country. Within the Khomeini regime, the right also looked for ways to take advantage of the invasion to strengthen its position.

In short, the war has not been a two-dimensional military conflict, but a three-dimensional political-social-military struggle in which the essential stake is the future of the mass movement in Iran.

Therefore, what revolutionists in Iran and in the region had to do was to try to mobilize the oppressed masses in both countries to oppose the Baathist aggression. This campaign had to be focused around the central task of *defending the Iranian revolution and putting an end to this war*.

Q: Was the Saddam regime simply acting as a proxy for imperialism in launching the war?

A: No, the relationship of neocolonial regimes to imperialism is not so simple. The Baathist regime had its own social interests, its own objectives and strategy in maneuvering with imperialism, and the specific national interests of the Iraqi bourgeoisie to advance.

Nowhere in the region was the impact of the Iranian revolution greater than in Iraq. It gave impetus to an upsurge of the so-called Shiite opposition to Saddam (which in reality is mainly the movement of the poor peasants, particularly in southern Iraq). It opened the way for the strengthening of the Kurdish movement struggling against national oppression. It encouraged a new wave of anti-imperialist feeling in a period in which the Iraqi bourgeoisie was preparing a shift toward a new increase in its integration into the world capitalist market.

The response of the Saddam regime to the Iranian revolution was a more marked shift to the right both internally and internationally, involving collaboration with ousted politicians and generals of the shah's regime, such as [ex-Prime Minister Shahpur] Bakhtiar and [Gen. Gholam] Oveissi.

The Iraqi regime began to advocate openly the overthrow of Khomeini's regime from the right and to systematically aid counter-revolutionary projects and schemes for coups in Iran.

The full-scale military aggression launched in September 1980 was simply the logical extension of this Baathist policy.

However, in mounting this attack, Saddam was able to take advantage of the reactionary chauvinist policies of the Khomeini leadership, such as the brutal repression in the Arab national minority in Iran, the "Greater Iran" nationalistic statements of the regime made under the cover of "pan-Islamic" rhetoric, and the refusal of the new government in Teheran to renounce the one-sided 1975 border treaty imposed on Iraq by the shah.

Although the Arab states and organizations did not raise open protests against the repression of the Iranian Arabs, the impact of this went very deep. For example, Khomeini ordered the closing of the PLO [Palestine Liberation Organization] office in Ahwaz, one of the main cities in the Arab area.

The Baathist regime also aimed at consolidating itself by getting the backing of the Gulf Emirates and Saudi Arabia. It sought, to a certain extent, to fill the gap left by the fall of the shah's regime as a major imperialist gendarme in the region, that is, to gain a privileged relationship with imperialism.

*For major documents of the HVK, see April 20, 1981, p. 396; June 15, 1981, p. 641; and October 4, 1982, p. 747. For major documents of the HKE, see July 26, 1982, p. 648; and October 4, 1982, p. 748.

The Baathists also hoped that the war would assist them in their project of shifting their alliances away from the USSR to the USA (this began in 1979, after the break with the Syrian regime).

Already before the war, the Iraqi regime was getting encouraging signals from U.S. imperialism, although indirectly, the French imperialists were offering help as a means of regaining a position in the region through Iraq.

However, there were contradictions between the aims of U.S. imperialism and those of the Baathist regime. For one thing, after the overthrow of the shah, the U.S. had to rely more and more on Zionism as its "strategic" ally in the Middle East. In no way could it rely on Saddam to be its main gendarme. And the Zionists have demonstrated in no uncertain way that they will not accept a reinforcement of the Iraqi regime.

In general, it was in the interest of U.S. imperialism that the Iraqi regime be kept in a weak and dependent position so that it could not upset its Israel-Egypt-Saudi Arabia axis. This in fact seems to explain, at least partly, why the Soviet bureaucracy has been willing to continue to pay the high and rising political cost involved in maintaining its support for Iraq in a war against the Iranian revolution. In fact both the Tudeh Party (the Iranian CP) and the Iraqi Communist Party condemned the Baathist aggression. Nonetheless, the Kremlin has continued to supply decisive military equipment to Iraq. This is hard to explain simply by the pursuit of diplomatic interests, since the Kremlin's main ally in the region is Syria, a violent enemy of the Baghdad government, and Moscow has been energetically wooing the Islamic Republic.

Thus, when the revolutionists in the region stated that this war served the interests of imperialism (and Washington in particular), it was not because they thought the Iraqi regime was directly carrying out U.S. policies. The war objectively served the designs of imperialism by creating a situation in which it could reinforce its military position in the area and step up its preparations for intervening militarily at a later stage. In this context, from the standpoint of imperialism, a weakening of the Iraqi regime itself was desirable.

For all these reasons, the question of how to approach mobilizing the masses against the Iraqi aggression presented some difficult tactical problems for revolutionists.

While stressing that we had to *condemn this war* between two semi-colonial bourgeois states and fight for the *unconditional withdrawal* of the Iraqi troops back behind the pre-September 21, 1980, border, we also emphasized that this war served none of the interests of the Iraqi or the Iranian masses. That meant that while we worked for mobilizing the Iranian masses against the military aggression, we warned against falling into the trap of defending the Khomeini regime, and helping it accomplish its objective of using the mass sentiment against the Iraqi aggression as a means of furthering its own chauvinistic aims.

We also had to proceed from the standpoint that the threat to the revolution from within was at least as great as the one from without, that they were in reality linked. We could not defend the revolution against Saddam by delivering ourselves bound hand and foot to the counterrevolution within Iran, which included the Khomeini regime.

Q: How was it possible to mobilize the masses against the Iraqi attack in independence from, and opposition to, the Khomeini regime, which came out of the revolutionary upsurge and the insurrection?

A: It is an oversimplification to view the Khomeini regime as the outcome of the mass upsurge and the insurrection.

Khomeini did not want an insurrection. He based himself on the mass mobilizations against the government in order to try to force the government to transfer power to him at the top. The insurrection was actually led in Teheran, the decisive place, by the left, by the Mujahedeen and the Fedayeen.

In Kurdistan, the Kurds carried out their own revolution parallel to the one in the Persian centers, but under their own leadership. They never accepted Khomeini's leadership. That explains why within a month after the fall of the shah, Khomeini started launching indiscriminate military attacks against the Kurdish centers.

The self-organization of the masses went further in Kurdistan than in the parts of the country where the Khomeini forces had effective control. The peasants began to take the land first in Kurdistan and Turkmenistan, an area inhabited by a brutally oppressed Mongol people who speak a Turkish language. No publication in their language was ever permitted. The first book published was a small collection of verse that appeared after the fall of the shah. Khomeini's pasdars (revolutionary guards) burnt every copy of it they could find.

Moreover, the mass movement that led to the insurrection split very quickly after the shah fell. Within two months after the overthrow, the Khomeini forces had succeeded in destroying or isolating and intimidating the local and factory committees, and had begun mounting violent attacks on the gains made by the masses. The mass movement was not smashed. There were subsequent upsurges, but the same political problems remained.

It is false and dangerous to maintain that at the time the Iraqis launched their attack in September 1980, the revolution was the same thing that it was in February 1979, a year and a half before, that is, a mass movement of the oppressed under the leadership of Khomeini.

The revolution, because of the Khomeinists' attacks on the masses and because of the rising expectations of the masses themselves, had come to have two completely opposed meanings for the vast majority of the toilers and oppressed in Iran.

There was the actual revolution, which meant the struggle of the toilers and the oppressed for the extension and unification of the

independent factory councils (the *shoras*) and for workers control. And there was the "revolution" (that is, the "Islamic" one), which meant destroying the independent shoras by setting up Islamic shoras, which were not elected, not democratic, and antileft, and installing watchdog committees of the regime called Islamic Societies (*Anjomanhaye Eslami*), which were run politically by the Islamic Republican Party (IRP) and linked to the repressive apparatus outside the factory.

The real revolution involved the movement of the oppressed nationalities for self-determination, the struggles of the poor peasants to form rural shoras, and of the women, students, soldiers, and other layers for the extension of democratic rights. Khomeini's "revolution" meant genocide against the national minorities, destruction of the peasant shoras, and the suppression of all democratic rights.

It was the first revolution that was threatened by the war. The second was already seen to mean *counterrevolution* by the vast majority of the revolutionary masses. It stood to gain from the Iraqi regime's aggression.

The situation at the time of the Iraqi attack was that there had been a very extensive experience of mass mobilization and experience and at the same time of betrayal of this and attacks on it by the Khomeini forces. In this context, it was possible to call for a revival of independent factory and neighborhood committees independent of the regime in order to oppose the attack. It did not mean necessarily opposing the regime directly, but it did mean appealing to the masses' understanding of the need to organize independently of it.

There were various tactical ways of applying this approach, but the fundamental problem was to avoid being pulled into building committees that were in fact means of political control and repression by the regime. This was essential because the war offered a pretext for strengthening the instruments of repression such as the army and the state's armed militias — which were already being used against the Iranian revolution. Secondly, it offered a pretext for increasing repression against the movement of the oppressed and the toilers in the name of "national defense" and "national unity." Thirdly, the war threatened to prepare the ground for a return of the forces of the old regime (through a coup linked to outside military intervention).

In fact, the attack came at a very dangerous point for the Iranian revolution. The masses were breaking from Khomeini, but this meant a moment of reflection and division, that is, of downturn of the mass mobilizations, and a certain skepticism on the part of broad layers. The disillusion with Khomeini threatened to lead to demoralization.

Moreover, in the wake of the seizure of the U.S. embassy and the taking of the hostages, Iran was isolated internationally, and the chances of an international outcry correspondingly less.

On the one hand, Iran was isolated diplomatically. On the other, the demagogic di-

version of the mass movement to focusing on symbolic questions and emotional anti-Americanism had created tremendous confusion and isolated the Iranian revolution from the real world anti-imperialist movement.

The attack came after the occupation and shutting down of the universities, that is, the new wave of repression launched by the Khomeini forces in the spring of 1980, after the mass upsurge of autumn 1979 had been successfully diverted and given time to burn itself out. At this point, those left offices remaining open were attacked and a new massive campaign was launched in Kurdistan.

Actually, the upsurge itself had followed the defeat of the regime's first attempt to re-stabilize the bourgeois state in the first war against the Kurdish people. This war, which was launched on a full scale in June 1979, included a massive repressive campaign throughout Iran. The Kurdish people defeated the Khomeini forces in August–September 1979.

When the embassy diversion had run its course, the government resumed the Kurdish war and the repression and the campaign to re-stabilize the bourgeois state.

Finally, at the time of the Iraqi attack, the Iranian army was torn by rifts between the army officers trained and promoted under the old regime and the pasdars, Khomeini's revolutionary guards.

So, the Iraqis apparently thought that they could score more decisive victories quickly and establish a base for the right in Iran in the "liberated zones."

Q: How big a victory were the Iraqis striking for — overthrowing the regime outright, establishing a protectorate over the oil-producing areas where there is a historic Arab majority?

A: There are documents indicating that there was an agreement between the rightists to set up a "provisional government." It is possible that the rightists misled the Iraqis about the situation in Iran. They would have had to give a totally false picture of it for anyone to think that the regime could be overthrown in that way. To overthrow the government militarily from Iraq would be an enormous undertaking, involving a long march across desert and mountains. There is no way the Iraqi government could have contemplated that.

The U.S. government warned the Iraqis against attempting to take the oil fields. And in point of fact, throughout the war they never made a serious attempt to seize them or put them out of operation.

By its nature, the Iraqi regime could not attempt to mobilize the Khuzistan Arabs; that would have represented as big a danger to it as to Khomeini. In fact, they waged a purely military campaign, and as a result the Arabs were driven from their homes and alienated. The Arabs were also the victims of spoliation and atrocities at the hands of the Iraqis.

On the other hand, there was a real danger that in conditions where demoralization was

already spreading among the masses, the human and material sacrifices imposed by the war would further weaken the will of the masses to resist and thereby open the way for a more rapid consolidation of the bourgeois state.

Q: What were the political results of the attack within Iran?

A: The immediate results tended to confirm the Iraqis' perspective. The reactionary officers in jail were freed to reorganize the Iranian army. A committee was set up immediately to negotiate a settlement to the conflict over the U.S. hostages (which ended in the Algiers agreement that signed away over half of Iranian foreign reserves. The details of this agreement have never been made public in Iran). Approaches started being made internationally to get arms from anyone willing to sell (and this eventually included Israel, from which at least two large sales are fairly well documented).

Strikes had previously been banned. But now they were dealt with by armed intervention inside the factory. To help the war effort, workers were forced to "step up production," which meant working sometimes up to 15 hours a day, and to give part of their pay (on the average three days' pay per month). The workers were also obliged to accept militarization of the factories by armed Islamic Societies (which now had a good cover for their reactionary role in the factories).

All the democratic gains of the soldiers were taken away, and a tough repressive code of discipline was reestablished in the armed forces.

Under the pretext of the war, the campaign against the Kurdish people was stepped up. The regime claimed that "the Kurds are basically serving the war aims of Saddam."

In fact, the Kurdish Democratic Party offered the government "a truce" in return for a joint campaign against the Iraqi Army.

The introduction of the land reform bill was postponed until "the forces of infidelity are defeated." All political discussions were banned in the high schools, and students now face armed Islamic Society members in every high school.

The left political parties were banned, including the Mujahedeen, which got nearly two million votes in the parliamentary elections according to the official figures and a lot more in reality. The pretext was that they were sabotaging the war effort.

In opposition to this, we called for arming the masses through their shoras (which meant fighting the regime's attempt to dissolve these bodies) and for a revival of the democratic neighborhood committees to organize the work of defense and military training (and therefore fighting the government's policy of using the Imam's Committees to suppress the mass movement in the neighborhoods).

We called for the soldiers to exercise control over their unreliable officers through their own shoras (and therefore for fighting the government's policy of reimposing the old discipline of the shah's army in the barracks).

Despite the downturn in the revolution and despite the demoralization of the masses, the Iraqi attack provoked a new wave of mass mobilizations against the war and for the defense of the revolution. Neighborhood committees revived, and independent workers defense committees were set up in many factories. In Teheran the day after the start of the war, spontaneous mass demonstrations began, calling on the government to arm the people. (They were suppressed by the pasdars.)

Q: Was it realistic to think that neighborhood and workers committees springing up spontaneously could play a real role in opposing a full-scale invasion by a large and well-equipped army?

A: In fact, the decisive battle of the war was won by fighters organized independently of the regime. That was the battle of Khorramshahr, which halted the Iraqi blitzkrieg. The population of the city, the vast majority of whom were Arabs, took up arms and stopped the Iraqi army for nine days. The army and the pasdars fled.

It was rumored at the time that the government had deliberately pulled the army out in order to avoid a confrontation with the masses. Later, documents were released by the IRP to prove that Bani-Sadr ordered the withdrawal as part of "his conspiracy to crush the Islamic revolution." That at least shows that the army was ordered to pull back, although now for its own purposes the IRP is trying to put the blame on Bani-Sadr.

The mass sentiment was so strong that the Khomeini regime itself was forced to concede that it was necessary to arm the masses and mobilize them outside the regular army and the pasdars. Baseej (mobilization) committees were set up in many neighborhoods to enroll the volunteers and canalize this sentiment. The committees were then put under the authority of the pasdars and used to provide cannon fodder for mass suicidal assaults.

The regime managed to keep the mass mobilizations from getting out of control by two means. First, the war zone was cleared of civilians. Military bases were set up in the middle of populous towns. No efforts were made to build civil defense shelters. And food shortages were allowed to continue, despite the massive support of the entire Iranian people for the front.

In Ahwaz, the central storehouse of ammunition was placed in the center of town. One night it exploded. The next day, at least a third of the population was in flight.

The depopulated towns were put under tight control of the pasdars and any independent mobilizations were brutally crushed.

In the first months of the war, at least 20 Mujahedeen supporters and 12 leftists, and many more Arabs were executed in the war zone as "armed saboteurs." In fact, they had been fighting the Iraqi army. Even independent medical aid was banned.

The Mujahedeen and Fedayeen medical tents in the area were attacked by the pasdars

and the staff was put in jail. Moreover, these groups had played a key role in the defense of Khorramshahr.

The second reason the government succeeded in getting a firm grip on the situation is that the major groups and parties of the left played into its hands. The Tudeh Party and the Fedayeen (Majority) took a line indistinguishable from that of the regime, calling on the masses to work harder, demand less and to help the government to organize its war effort.

The Mujahedeen also, who had called for independent mobilizations in the beginning, quickly dropped this. They entered into an alliance with Bani-Sadr, who was trying to use the war to strengthen his faction in the ruling apparatus (based on the army, the technocrats, and a section of the clergy) as an alternative to the IRP. This alliance required dropping independent mobilizations since Bani-Sadr was against that.

The Mujahedeen made a mistake similar to those who thought it was necessary to support Khomeini in order to oppose the Iraqis.

Bani-Sadr tried to base himself on the rising demands for democratic rights, the mass reaction against the demagoguery and antidemocratic attitudes of the mullahs and the IRP.

It was to that sentiment that Bani-Sadr owed his overwhelming victory in the presidential election. He appeared to represent the popular will, on the basis of an election that was less rigged than the parliamentary elections, in which the IRP was able to control the polls and thus assure that its people got in.

Of course, the presidential election was not that free either, since "non-Islamic" candidates were banned, but by comparison it smelt like a rose.

The Mujahedeen, who were influenced by Maoism and bourgeois populism at their origin, therefore decided that Bani-Sadr represented the democratic bourgeoisie and therefore the democratic alternative. In fact, he was just as determined to stamp out the basis of real democracy in the conditions of the revolutionary crisis in Iran, the independent mobilization of the masses.

The Mujahedeen used the government's repression against them as a pretext for withdrawing from involvement in the mass mobilizations and to throw all their weight behind Bani-Sadr's solution (a palace coup).

Khomeini's regime gradually succeeded in consolidating its power through the IRP-dominated parliament, the vastly strengthened Pasdaran, and an IRP government. Linked to the so-called mass committees, which had become instruments of repression — the Imam's Committees, Reconstruction Crusade (*Jihad Sazendegi*) and the Basej — the Khomeini government started preparing for a showdown with the so-called liberal faction, having already crushed the left.

Q: What effect did this have on the attitude of the masses to the war?

A: From that point on, coming about six months after the outbreak of the war, larger

and larger sections of the masses began to regard the government's war effort as simply a maneuver to consolidate the power of the IRP and crush the revolution. This did not mean that they did not want to see the Iraqi army defeated. It meant only that they realized that the government was crushing the mass movement and thereby sabotaging the war effort and therefore not fighting the imperialist plans.

In this phase, only the government was saying "the central issue facing us is the war with the infidel Saddam." The masses were already mobilizing in all the major cities around democratic demands and a program of social reforms.

In the absence of a powerful revolutionary organization, this movement could very easily be strangled by Bani-Sadr, who was trying to improve the position of his own faction within the ruling class.

The next three months were basically taken up by the regime's preparing for the overthrow of Bani-Sadr and the containment of the mass movement against repression and for social justice. In this period, the demagoguery about the "pan-Islamic" aims of the war was stepped up. Fantastically exaggerated reports of mass revolts against the Saddam regime were constantly trumpeted in the totally controlled press and media.

In many cities, the vastly increased forces of the state apparatus were being used openly to intensify repression. Mujahedeen members were being attacked and killed on the streets. There were more than 100 known cases in northern Iran alone. Purges of militants in the factories were intensified. In Teheran alone, over 1,500 workers were either arrested or dismissed.

The campaign against the Kurdish people reached genocidal proportions, with bombardments of the villages and forced evacuation of the population from the strategically important regions (e.g. Saghez and Baneh areas).

Those political groups who had refused to fight for independent mobilization of the masses and which had helped to strengthen the instruments of the mullahs' repression by providing them with a left cover now found themselves forced into the position of actively aiding the repression.

Fedayeen (Majority) and Tudeh Party members were involved in the Islamic Societies, which were spying on the militant workers and reporting them to the government authorities.

By early June 1981, the Khomeini faction was ready to move. Bani-Sadr, seeing the handwriting on the wall, issued a call for a referendum so that the people could show who they supported, him or the IRP-dominated parliament. He did not, however, call for any mass mobilization to back this up. And he was quickly deposed as chief of the armed forces and later as president.

Demonstrations in support of Bani-Sadr, which were mainly organized by the Mujahedeen, were brutally crushed. A rally in front of the parliament building in Teheran was machine-gunned. On that occasion alone, over

170 people were killed. A quick deal was struck with the leaders of the army, who were considered Bani-Sadr supporters. As it happened, they died in a suspicious airplane crash a few months later.

The Mujahedeen's response to this wave of terror was to adopt the tactic of "armed struggle." In practice, this meant assassinating individual government leaders. They did not call for, or try to build, mobilizations and strikes, although they were by this time a mass organization capable of calling hundreds of thousands of people into the streets in their own name. The growing mass opposition to Khomeini was polarized mainly by them.

In fact, their "armed struggle" was the outcome of their class-collaborationist political line. They thought that by weakening the pro-Khomeini faction, the way would be opened for the "more progressive" liberal faction to come to power in collusion with the army, and that such an alternative would then be supported by the masses. Their bourgeois friends in the government would not, of course, have approved of general strikes and mass mobilizations.

This tactic simply played into the hands of the regime. The masses were further demoralized and demobilized. The forces of repression were unleashed with savage ferocity. The day after the explosion at the IRP headquarters, at least 15,000 people were arrested in Teheran, of which at least 3,000 were militant workers from every factory. (From Evin Jail a caravan of buses went down Teheran-Karaj road, calling on every factory and picking up workers named by the Islamic Societies.)

Street executions, house raids, wholesale purges, mass arrests, and mass executions followed. In the course of one year, over 20,000 political prisoners have been executed in Iran, and over 60,000 persons are being kept imprisoned for political reasons.

Obviously a terror of this scope was aimed at the mass movement as a whole. All the independent organizations have been broken up or driven far underground; the major gains of the revolution have been rolled back. This is why despite the victories at the front, we have not seen a rise in the mass movement, and in fact repression has increased.

This is tragic confirmation of our position at the start that the only way to defend the revolution effectively was to avoid being trapped and disarmed by our enemy at home. *It has been shown that there is a danger that we can win the war and lose the revolution.*

Once the real revolution was stopped and rolled back, the regime began to back away even from its own demagogic nationalization plans and land reforms.

The regime did pursue the war effort against Iraq. But this took on an ever-increasing chauvinistic character, with constant declarations of intent to impose a "truly Islamic" government on Iraq.

The masses were called on to foot the bill with ever-increasing human and material sac-

rifices. The Iraqi army was defeated in a number of major battles, but at the cost of the lives of over 70,000 Iranian youth, 150,000 crippled, and more than 2 million war refugees.

Most basic necessities are now rationed. The standard of living has fallen by over 50 percent by comparison with what it was in the last years of the shah. A vast black market run by the Pasdaran and the bureaucrats has now developed. The whole country is mourning its dead.

Victories won in such circumstances did not result in mass jubilation. The response was just a sigh of relief and a hope that the war would end soon.

Not even the victory at Khorramshahr was greeted by mass demonstrations. The demonstration called by the government in Teheran to celebrate the victory did not draw more than 100,000 participants, a comparatively small number for the circumstances and the society.

With his army demoralized and facing defeat, Saddam was by this time under great pressure to end the war. Furthermore, the capitalists in Iraq had achieved most of the objectives they sought in launching this war. There was a lot of money to be made through the many deals concluded with Western imperialist interests (estimated to involve \$65 billion). And for the most part, these contracts are to go into effect only after the war ends.

The Iranian government, however, insisted on stepping up the war and talking in terms of setting up an Islamic Republic in Iraq and of a pan-Islamic revolution throughout the region. There were certain contradictions in the line, with some of the military commanders talking about going into Iraq only far enough to assure that Iranian cities could not be shelled from Iraqi positions. Such vacillations were ended by the Imam himself immediately after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

Large numbers of people volunteered to go to Lebanon and defend the Palestinians. The government feared that this could upset its own reactionary designs. Khomeini declared that in fact the invasion of Lebanon was "an imperialist conspiracy to divert attention from the Iranian victories" in the war with Saddam. He declared that "the forces of Islam are prepared to go to Lebanon but only through Baghdad."

The regime's motivations are not difficult to understand. The end of the war would produce an explosive political situation in Iran. Furthermore, the rainy season will soon begin, making military operations impossible on the southern front. The cold weather in the mountains would have a similar effect in the north. So, the government could maintain a phoney war for several months.

If the war ended, the war refugees would have to return to Khuzistan, and a new nationwide movement for social and economic reforms would begin. Secondly, it would be difficult for the government to justify maintaining the military instruments forged in this war — the hugely inflated corps of pasdars, and so on.

Thirdly, the Iranian government looked to a

Shiite uprising in Iraq linked to the advance of the Iranian army as a good solution to all its political and social problems.

For these reasons, the Iranian regime has embarked on a dangerous course which can only bring greater material and human losses and therefore a deeper political crisis sooner or later for it itself, a course which has the effect of increasing the threat of imperialist intervention in the entire region, including in Iran itself.

This is because the war is dividing the oppressed people of the region in the face of imperialism and because the Iranian advance is seen by the overwhelming majority of the Iraqi people as a threat to their national independence, to the gains of their national revolution, and to the aspirations of the Arab people. It is reconsolidating the reactionary Baathist regime and providing a justification for the passivity of the Arab regimes in the face of the imperialist attacks in Lebanon.

Moreover, in circumstances when the Khomeini regime is being regarded with disillusion by a growing majority of the Iranian masses, the military defeat that is likely if the war is pursued could precipitate a radical shift in the balance of forces in favor of imperialism and its most subservient local agents.

That is, defeat of the Iranian army followed by mass demoralization could provide favorable conditions for the old counterrevolutionary forces of capitalism in Iran. Khomeini's "Islamic" counterrevolution is thus only preparing the ground for a final crushing of the Iranian revolution that would involve the destruction of his own regime.

The extent of the repression, which no one can deny is massive, shows the real state of the mass movement and the real balance of forces in the country.

Effective democratic and trade-union rights are the result of a favorable relationship of forces for the proletariat and the masses.

'Socialism and Revolution'

[The following are major excerpts from an introductory "Note" published in the first issue of *Socialism va Engelab* (Socialism and Revolution), dated October–November 1982. The magazine is published in Paris and describes itself as "a discussion bulletin of revolutionary socialists." The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

The monthly publication of *Socialism va Engelab* begins its work under conditions in which the anticapitalist revolutionary movement of the masses of the Iranian toilers and oppressed has been blocked.

Owing to the regime of the *mullahs* [Islamic clergy], exploitation and autocracy by the possessing classes is returning with no less intensity than before. World capitalism is altering the relationship of forces in the region still more in the interests of reaction. The fighting

The mistake that is made by those who mistake the demagogy of the regime for mass radicalization is that they leave politics out of the equation in calculating the balance of forces. In order to fight effectively, the masses have to have some concrete political perspective and a leadership that really represents their interests. There are other historical examples of the collapse of very powerful mass movements when these decisive factors are lacking.

For example, in Italy, some local Communist Party leaderships built up mass insurrectionary movements during the war, thinking that this was the real line of Stalin. When Moscow turned against them after the war, they collapsed politically and so did the movements they led, although these included hundreds of thousands of conscious revolutionary fighters.

I have described how the development of a mass political leadership was diverted and crushed. Those who now maintain, against overwhelming evidence, that the mass movement is continuing to go forward are obliged in fact to try to present Khomeini and the IRP as a kind of revolutionary leadership, albeit with *contradictions*. That has a certain logic, but it is political lunacy.

Q: In this situation, what should revolutionaries do?

A: We must call for an immediate end to this war and put forward a program of social and economic demands representing the interests and the deeply felt needs of the toiling and oppressed masses.

We have to call on the masses to resist in every way possible this regime of hangmen and deceivers, to return to the traditions and the experience of the mass movement that overthrew the shah, which this government in no way represents. It is the gravedigger of that movement. □

institutions of self-organization of the masses have been destroyed and the revolutionary vanguard has been smashed to pieces. Through the total loss of the achievements of an entire historical period of revolutionary struggles, what has resulted is nothing less than the consolidation of medieval, parasitic counterrevolution that has endangered the entire social fabric of the country.

Among the latest developments in this tragicomic process of regression, it is sufficient to note that the obvious signs of defeat are now being used to justify the definitive attachment of major sections of those forces claiming to represent progress and revolution (that is, petty-bourgeois intellectuals claiming to be Marxists and Leninists) to the different currents of bourgeois liberals, who were the main administrators responsible for the defeat. The only signs of political life among these dead souls who survived their "glorious revolution"

is their furious competition in advertising various "democratic" regimes in the marketplace of bankrupts.

All these forces have a common denominator: "The revolution is defeated. Let us accept a moderate [!] bourgeois regime."

No!

Firstly, this defeat did not come about all of a sudden. The history of the Iranian revolution is the *history of its defeats*. Today's ruling counterrevolution was yesterday's leadership of the revolution. The same relations, illusions, and expectations that the Khomeini leadership forced on the revolutionary movement of the masses also guaranteed the decisive defeat of the revolution. And our same petty-bourgeois intellectual heroes, who have never been free of such traits and never will be, now serve as propagandists and agitators for the historical leftovers of the miserable Iranian bourgeoisie.

Secondly, it was not the revolution that lost in this defeat. What was really exposed were the different currents of the so-called national and liberal bourgeoisie of Iran and their petty-bourgeois fellow-travelers. And this is the *positive aspect* of the 1979 revolution. The liberation of the revolutionary proletarian vanguard from petty-bourgeois illusions is not the result of the spontaneous February insurrection, but the result of its series of defeats. In the course of this revolution an enemy has come into existence, and only through the struggle against it can the real party of the revolution achieve maturity.

In the rocky ditches of the acceptance of something less than a social transformation, the revolution has suddenly come face to face with the quicksand of the *mullahs'* counterrevolution. But at the same time the revolution has confirmed its necessity and, as a result, its *actuality*.

The revolution has ended in defeat. But what has now arrived is the period of fundamental struggles to forge a new alignment of revolutionary socialism, the historic alternative of the Iranian proletariat. The movement of the toilers for *shoras* [committees] is being destroyed. But the struggle of the revolutionary vanguard in workers' action committees prepares the way for the political general strike and the creation of the workers' revolutionary alternative, and offers hope for a true movement of free and independent shoras of workers and peasants in the next period. The organizations that claim to represent the toilers are being torn to pieces, but at the same time, the conditions for a *definitive break* of revolutionary socialism from petty-bourgeois democracy have never been more ripe than in this period.

Socialism va Engelab takes as its responsibility the task of proving these points.

Editorial Board
October–November 1982

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

Israel

Polls show West Bank Palestinians back PLO

[We are reprinting the following article from *AJME News*, published monthly in Beirut, Lebanon, by Americans for Justice in the Middle East.]

* * *

For the past thirty-four years both the Jordanian and Israeli governments have claimed to base their action concerning the occupied West Bank on the attitudes of the area's Palestinian residents. However, the Palestinians have never before had a chance to speak for themselves. Now, two separate public opinion polls, the first of their kind conducted in the West Bank, have given them that chance.

The polls were conducted by the Israeli Public Opinion Research Institute (PORI) and Najah University by the West Bank city of Nablus. The PORI poll, conducted in conjunction with Hebrew University, was commissioned by *Time* magazine.

Both polls showed that a majority of Palestinians consider the PLO to be their sole legitimate representative, though the percentages varied considerably: 88 percent, according to the *Time* poll, and 66 percent according to the Najah University survey.

Similarly, both polls found that a majority of respondents wanted a Palestinian state under the leadership of the PLO (86% according to *Time* and 76% according to Najah University). Fully 50 percent of those queried in the *Time* poll wanted Yasser Arafat personally to lead a Palestinian state, while another 19 percent favored other PLO leaders (DPFLP leader Nayef Hawatmeh: 12 percent; PFLP chief George Habash: 7 percent*). Another 25 percent of respondents wanted none of these three, presum-

*The DPFLP is the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine; the PFLP, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

ably preferring local West Bank leaders. Of these, by far the most popular was ousted Nablus Mayor Bassam Shakaa (favored by 68 percent).

As for the form a Palestinian state should take, the *Time* poll found that more than half the respondents favored a democratic and secular state (56 percent), while 35 percent favored an Islamic government.

Interestingly, the poll commissioned by *Time* confirmed the often-stated position of those familiar with the Middle East that although the Palestinians (72 percent) admire the Soviet Union for their support of the Palestinian cause, only a small percentage favor communism as a system of government (16 percent).

As for the economic system of a future Palestinian state, a majority favored socialism (57 percent) while 18 percent favored a mixed system. Only 3 percent favored pure capitalism.

The Najah University poll, based on 2,775 respondents, found that 79 percent of those questioned believe that an Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank can take place only by force. Only 1.29 percent expressed support for the Camp David autonomy plan.

Both research efforts were opposed by the Israeli government. In the case of the Najah University poll, Israeli occupation authorities confiscated 110 questionnaires and arrested the survey's interviewers before the study had been fully completed. When the Israeli authorities learned of the poll commissioned by *Time* magazine, they invoked an Israeli military law which forbids the publication of material with "political significance" and another which bans the "publication or oral expression of praise, sympathy or support for a hostile organization." The Israeli authorities arrested one of the PORI poll-takers and confiscated some of his data. □



Demonstrators in West Bank hoist Palestinian flag.