

TRUTH



**WORKERS
OF THE
WORLD,
UNITE!**

ORGAN OF THE TROTSKYIST ORGANIZATION USA/FRATERNAL SECTION/FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
FOR A TROTSKYIST CONGRESS REBUILDING THE U.S. SECTION OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

After April 25th -- Which direction for working people and youth?

The April 25th demonstration in Washington D.C. is the largest mass action against US intervention since Reagan's election in 1980. More than 125,000 demonstrated in Washington D.C. and 75,000 in San Francisco.

Despite the letter of Lane Kirkland, president of the AFL-CIO, prohibiting state and local affiliates from participating in the march, large union contingents were evident in the marches. Even more important than the numbers of marchers, however, was the involvement of youth who swelled the ranks of marchers to a degree not seen since the sixties.

At the same time that April 25th marks the culmination of a period of protest which has developed against Reagan's policies, particularly against the "dirty war" on the people of Nicaragua and Central America, it is also a new beginning. It is a beginning in the sense that, while it was not planned as an action explicitly connected to the crisis of the Reagan administration, nevertheless it can only deepen that crisis. And secondly, it is a beginning in that it shows an awakening of a new generation of the working class and the youth.

American workers and youth need to understand that this political crisis in the Reagan administration is international in its context and its scope. It reflects the resistance of American workers and youth to Reagan's policies, a resistance that is itself connected to the struggles of working people the world over, particularly in the countries oppressed by imperialism. This opening of the revolutionary process, that is the upsurge of the working class internationally, begun with the revolution in Iran and Nicaragua, culminating in the mobilization of Polish workers against Stalinist rule -- is directly linked to renewed combativity of workers and youth in the advanced capitalist na-

tions, that is imperialism itself. Thus the miners strike in Great Britain, and the recent mobilization of French students, the continuation of this mobilization in Spain, and the April 25th march represent a second wave of the revolutionary process opened up in the late seventies.

Precisely because the American capitalist class -- through the Reagan administration -- has attempted to re-establish its hegemony over all the forces of world imperialism, and because this counterrevolutionary attempt is now in a state of crisis, the actions of American workers and youth are going to be magnified in the eyes of the world.

The April 25th demonstration then shows two things very clearly. First the international opening provided by the crisis of the Reagan administration, and secondly, the inadequacy of the leadership of April 25, its inability to carry through with a policy capable of delivering a solid blow to the ruling class, and one capable of strengthening the unity of the oppressed against their oppressors, the unity of workers against bosses, the unity of a new generation of young fighters against imperialism and its "dirty war".

Contents

<i>The Secret Government</i>	4
<i>The London Meeting</i>	5
<i>Gorbachev's Promises</i>	11
<i>The IC in the United States</i>	22
<i>SAT</i>	28
<i>Class Struggle in America</i>	39
<i>French Student Leader Speaks</i>	22
<i>A Response</i>	71
<i>Global Conflict</i>	24

The question of the moment then becomes, what is the responsibility of the most class conscious elements of the working class? Where is the road forward from April 25th?

Impeach Reagan

We need to deepen the crisis of the government and deliver a blow to its counterrevolutionary plots. This means above all not allowing ourselves to become passive spectators to the crisis, to the contrary, we must seek to organize workers and youth to take an active role in the crisis. This is the basis upon which we have raised demand for impeachment -- that is, for mass actions like April 25th to demand openly that the House of Representatives bring articles of impeachment against Reagan. This demand, even though it represents essentially a democratic demand, is in today's situation a bridge for the most class conscious fighters to reach and embolden the masses and their opposition to Reagan's policies.

Outside of such an active process opening up the crisis to the intervention of the masses, what we are saying in essence is that there is really nothing to be upset about in the revelations that

have already come forward in this crisis. This is after all just business as usual for capitalism, right?

Wrong. Such an attitude is nonsense, worse it is dangerous! Precisely because the ruling class has not been able to close ranks as yet around a permanent solution to the Reagan government's crisis, important elements of the ruling classes game plan have been compromised. One of the more directly important facts that has come forward is the renewed and deepened activity of spying by the FBI on political oppositions in the US. These domestic spying activities, and only the tip of the iceberg has been exposed, are part and parcel of a "secret government" that has been developed by the Reagan administration to effectively deal with the revolutionary process opened up in 1979 with the fall of the Shah in Iran and the fall of Somoza in Nicaragua. US imperialism has been rebuilding itself under Reagan, an open investigation with the goal of destroying this operation, a framework that is given by the demand for impeachment, would be an important victory by itself.

Adding to this the evident bi-partisan determination to continue its "dirty war" in Nicaragua and Central America, and it is clear that a passive attitude toward the crisis of the Reagan administration is utterly irresponsible. The demand for impeachment is directly connected to the movement that brought forth April 25th, and more importantly, directly connected to its continuation.

Class Unity

Secondly, we need to forge a united front against all the attacks of the ruling class. This is essentially a matter of building the unity of one class against another. Here we are not talking about a false unity that buries the differences between different tendencies in the working class movement -- but rather a unity in action of all of the sectors of the working class against US imperialism and its two parties, the Democrats and Republicans. This unity can only come from, and be inspired by, the most advanced and class conscious elements of the working class -- the organizations of the working class vanguard.

The mass action against US intervention that April 25th was, the mobilization of Blacks against racist attacks, the strikes of workers against the bosses, all constitute different battalions of the working class engaged in battle against the capitalist class. Precisely because these struggles are dispersed, and separate -- primarily because their leaderships have a parasitical, class collaborationist policy rather than a healthy character -- the overall effect of these battles are blunted. The united front in action, uniting these sectors of the working class in a common struggle to bring down the government they hate and despise, offers the best conditions for fighting the bureaucratism and class collaboration of their leaders. In other words, the united front paves the way for the program and the reality of socialist revolution.

TRUTH No. 219 May, 1987

Organ of the Trotskyist Organization of the USA,

Fraternal section of the Fourth International,

For a Trotskyist Congress Rebuilding the US section of the Fourth International

P.O. Box 32546, Detroit, Michigan 48232

Editorial Board: Kevin Fitzpatrick, Margaret Guttshall, David Mark, Fred Michaels, Barbara Putnam

Subscriptions to *Truth and Fourth International*:

Introductory: (3 issues of *Truth* and 3 issues of *Fourth International*) -- \$2

Regular: (12 issues of each) -- \$10

Supporting: (12 issues of each) -- \$20

Labor Party

In the past period, our tendency has raised the united front in different contexts. In the period directly preceding the April actions of 1985, we put forward the slogan of a Workers Front to Defend Nicaragua. This demand was directly connected to the anti-intervention movement and represented an attempt to forge a working class front against the policies of conciliators to the Democratic Party in this movement.

Today, however, with the summits of the bourgeois state in complete crisis, the demand for a Labor Party is key to all the struggles of the working class. And this is our final point, which represents as well a central lesson that can be drawn from the Watergate crisis under Richard Nixon.

The movement of the working class and the youth must have a political expression outside of the bourgeois parties if it is to go forward. The present crisis, in which the ruling class is desperately seeking to find a way to channel the anger of the working class into the Democratic Party (and a greatly weakened and decrepit Democratic Party we might add) only sharpens the political alternatives. To fail to meet this sharpening of the political struggle with an equally sharp tactic -- the demand for a Labor Party -- must result in adaptation to the other alternative.

Once again, the program for socialist revolution cannot live outside of the constant initiative of revolutionaries to develop a bridge to and embolden the actions of the masses. Therefore, our organization has taken initiatives already to forge a front of other working class political organizations

who are for a Labor Party, in order to make this demand a reality in the minds of workers and youth -- and a reality in history. That is, we have begun to build an Alliance for a Labor Party (see issue # of Truth) and have carried out several actions in its name. This demand can and must be deepened in the 1988 elections by a common campaign of working class organizations to put forward a presidential candidate -- an alternative to the capitalist parties in action.

These then are the conclusions we have drawn from the great mass action of April 25th: -- for the Impeachment of Reagan and the downfall of the Secret Government;

-- for the **Unity of Workers and Youth against the Capitalists;**

-- for an **Alliance to Build a Labor Party.**

We call on all other organizations of the working class to take up this fight as the basis upon which the program and perspective of socialist revolution can come alive in the international opening that the crisis of the Reagan administration represents.

SUBSCRIBE TO OUR NEWSPAPER !

Subscriptions to *Truth* and *Fourth International*:

Introductory: (3 Issues of *Truth* and 3 Issues of *Fourth International*) -- \$2

Regular: (12 Issues of each) -- \$10

Supporting: (12 Issues of each) -- \$20

Name _____

Street address _____

City/State/Zip _____

(Make check payable to *Truth*) Send to: P.O. Box 32546, Detroit, Michigan 48232

The Secret Government

Under the protection of the Reagan administration and in direct liaison with it, a "secret government" conducts the dirty war against the Nicaraguan people. Lt. Col. Oliver North was at best a "junior" to the ex-generals who ran the secret operations in Nicaragua.

Foundations and Corporations

A series of foundations and dummy corporations were set up to screen the secret government from the American public. The foundations were utilized to gain the support of intellectuals, politicians of both the Democrats and Republicans, capitalists, and yes, even labor in the defense of the butchers that Reagan calls the "freedom fighters".

Project Democracy. Umbrella network set up by the Reagan administration to engage in secret operations -- in reality, establishing a secret and illegal government. In 1982, when Project Democracy was set up, the White issued a memorandum: "we need to examine how law and executive order can be made more liberal to permit covert actions on a broad scale." The Project was bi-partisan and included many prominent supporters, Lane Kirkland, president of the AFL-CIO, and Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers were two of them.

Carl Channel and the National Endowment for the Preservation of Liberty. Now in the national headlines after pleading guilty to income tax fraud, Channel and his foundations provided financial contributions and a link between the White House and the secret government. Incidentally, they also provided Channel and other right-wing "patriots" with get rich quick schemes.

The dummy corporations. A number of businesses were established for the purpose of conducting the day to day operations that supplied the contras. These corporations functioned as an arm of the White House, which was prohibited by the Boland amendment from giving aid to the contras during this period. These corporations included Southern Air Transport (formerly owned by the CIA), International Business Communications (a public relations firm with security clearance and a secret contract with the State Department to help the contras), and many others.

The "Board of Directors"

A core group of three ex-generals and one ex-CIA agent functioned as the head of the secret government:

Maj. Gen. John Singlaub, retired. Acted both in covert and overt capacities as the chairman of the "Board". Singlaub was a direct liaison with the Reagan administration for the

private contra funding effort. His history goes back to secret operations in Vietnam and Laos. In 1966-68 he was Chief of the Studies and Operations Group (SOG) in Vietnam which launched covert operations in Laos. Singlaub was forced to resign by Carter for political insubordination in 1978 over the withdrawal of US troops from S. Korea.

Maj. Gen. Richard Secord, retired. Also worked at SOG under Singlaub. Secord flew to Iran with Robert McFarlane and North in May of '86. He heads up several arms sales companies. Telephone calls from his Virginia firm, Stanford Technology Trading Group, were traced to an El Salvador safe house occupied by Eugene Hasenfus and his pilot William Cooper.

Theodore Shackley. CIA station chief in Laos at the time of Singlaub's and Secord's operations in Indochina. He directed anti-Castro operations in Miami in 1962-72, including the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

Thomas Clines. A former CIA officer, referred to by author Peter Maas (Manhunt) to have promoted a deal with Somoza, the former dictator of Nicaragua ousted by the revolution, to create a search and destroy operation against the Sandinistas. Now involved with the supply operation to the contras.

The underlings

Robert Brown. Publisher of Soldier of Fortune magazine, formerly associated with Singlaub at SOG in Vietnam, he aided in the recruitment of Vietnam vets as mercenaries in Central America.

Luis Posada. Associate of Felix Rodriguez, former CIA agent, in contra supply operations. He was arrested for attempting to blow up a Cuban civilian airliner.

Jorge Ochoa. Linked to drug operations of Southern Air Transport which were used to fund contra operations. Personal flight logs of the copilot of the C-123 aircraft shot down over Nicaragua show that at least two landings were made in October of 1985 at the Barranquilla airport in Columbia, a standard cocaine exit point.

Frank Varelli. Worker for the FBI in 1981-84 as an informer in CISPES and also fingered Central American refugees for deportation. Under oath he testified to a House Subcommittee that the FBI had informed him the domestic spying operation had been "ordered by the White House."

Barbara Walters. The well known news anchor-woman worked as a go-between linking Reagan with Manucher Ghorbanifar and Adnan Khashoggi, principals in the arms peddling deal with Iran that funded the contras. She delivered

The London Meeting: Still No Explanation for Exclusions

By Margaret Guttshall

As many readers already know, the Trotskyist Organization has been very concerned with the preparation of an international conference to take up the problems of building the Fourth International. We see this as essential to resolving the crisis of leadership internationally and especially in the U.S. Thus we fought for this to be the central question taken up by the Trotskyist/Revolutionary Conference in San Francisco, we supported the British Workers Revolutionary Party's initiative in this direction, and when the WRP actually issued a call for such a conference we supported it, pledged our participation, and urged others to do the same.

Our efforts have been part of those of the Fourth International (rebuilt) as a whole. In fact, the Fourth International and the WRP have been involved in both discussions and practical collaboration concerning an international conference since the WRP split with Healy. This has included numerous meetings in both London and Paris, a tour in defense of the Polish workers in Britain, a tour in defense of British miners in Spain, as well as other initiatives. After we received and discussed the WRP's call in February, a comrade from the Trotskyist Organization went to London, both as a spokesman for the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International and the Trotskyist Organization, to express our support for this call and discuss the preparation of this conference. He met with representatives of the WRP leadership and discussed with them at length at that time.

Thus, when we received a letter from the WRP Political Committee (dated March 23, 1987 and signed by S. Pirani) calling for a meeting to constitute a committee to prepare the international conference in London on April 11 and 12, it was quite natural for both the Trotskyist Organization and the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International to participate.

However, when the Trotskyist Organization's delegate, Margaret Guttshall, contacted the WRP headquarters in London to make arrangements for participation (April 1), Dot Gibson, WRP Political Committee member, read a letter to her with additional conditions for participation (dated April 1 and signed "Conference Secretary"). At the time we expressed concern. Comrade Guttshall said: "What if we accept these conditions, come all the way to London, then find more conditions." Comrade Gibson said: "Oh no, don't worry, this is the last thing."

But this is exactly what happened. When Comrade Guttshall contacted Comrade Gibson April 7 to tell her that the International Executive Committee had discussed the conditions and had decided to accept them, that she was about to leave, Comrade Gibson raised more questions, said we still might not be able to participate. When Comrade Guttshall arrived at the WRP headquarters, April 8, Bob Archer, WRP Political Committee member, and Leon Perez, representative of the International Workers League (formerly led by the late Nahuel Moreno), started making more demands, including repudiating or withdrawing an article written by one of our French comrades and a statement in favor of an open conference signed by the Trotskyist Organization and two American organizations.

And so it went, from Wednesday morning, April 8, until late Saturday night, April 11. At each point that it seemed that we might reach agreement on our participation, another objection emerged. Finally, late Saturday night, Dave Temple, a member of the WRP Central Committee, speaking for the Preparatory Committee, said: "Your application for observership has been rejected because we have decided there will be no observers."

We wrote a letter to the WRP leadership protesting our exclusion and asking for a written explanation. To date, we have not heard a word. Instead an article appeared in *Workers Press*, No. 70, dated April 18, 1987, that simply says:

"... The first item on the agenda of the meeting was the setting up of the Preparatory Committee to organize the conference. Applications from several organizations were discussed and the composition of the committee was agreed by unanimous vote."

Here everything is turned upside down. The WRP *invites* various tendencies to participate in the meeting, *disinvites them* after they travel half way around the world to get there, then declares that their "applications ... were discussed," and rejected! The authors of the article, Bob Archer and Leon Perez, Interim Secretariat, Preparatory Committee, neglect to mention that all organizations represented at the meeting, with one exception, were affiliated to the WRP, the International Workers League (IWL, formerly led by the late Nahuel Moreno), or the Group of Opposition and Continuity of the Fourth International (GOCFI, led by Michel Varga), and that there were representatives of as many organizations left standing in the hall all day Saturday as there were participating in the meeting. These included the Trotskyist Organization of the USA, the Fourth International (rebuilt), the International Trotskyist Committee (with which the Revolutionary Workers League of the USA is affiliated), the Workers Socialist League of the USA, the Revolutionary

Workers Group of Italy, and the Workers Revolutionary League of Belgium (finally admitted late Saturday night).

In *Workers Press*, No. 71, dated April 25, 1987, there's another article on the preparation of the international conference called "For an honest discussion!" by Mike Howgate. This article defends the exclusion of organizations that think the Fourth International is dead, like Workers Power, or that might not be for the construction of Trotskyist parties in all countries, like the United Secretariat, yet says not a word about the Trotskyist Organiza-

tion, the Fourth International (rebuilt), or others, which hardly fit into these categories.

We are still waiting for an explanation. In the meantime, we are publishing, in this issue of *Truth*, the letters we received from the WRP, our reply, as well as our letter protesting our exclusion.

In the next issue of *Truth* there will be a full report on the political developments in the preparation of the international conference and how to carry forward the struggle.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE:

French:

La Quatrieme Internationale

La Verite (Organ of the Revolutionary Workers League of France)

Revolution Permanente (Organ of the Antilles Committee of the Fourth International)

Nouvelle Etape by Gerard Laffont

Elements d'un Bilan (pour un Congres Trotskyiste) by Daniel Assouline

Les Trotskyistes Dans La Revolution Polonaise, by Alain Cavalier

Polish:

Walka Klas

Spanish:

La Cuarta Internacional

La Aurora (Organ of the Revolutionary Workers Party of Spain)

Insurreccion (Organ of the Bolivian Committee of the Fourth International)

Anti-Carrillo by Anibal Ramos

Ensayo General by Anibal Ramos

Los Trotskyistas en la Revolution Polaca by Alain Cavalier

For prices and further information, write to us at :

Truth

P.O. Box 32546

Detroit, Michigan 48232

(Below we reprint the initial letter sent by the WRP specifying conditions for the London meeting)

PO Box 735
London SW9 7QS
Tel: 01-274 7271

23rd March 1987

To:

Dear Comrades,

On 26th January, we sent you our Call for an International Conference to Reorganise the Fourth International. Some replies have indicated that there may be confusion in relation to the composition of the Preparatory Committee.

For your information we now attach a copy of the original circular, and set out below the resolution agreed by our Political Committee:

"In accordance with the statement of the Central Committee, making the call for the international conference, we resolve:

- (a) To convene a first meeting of the preparatory committee of all those who declare agreement in principle with the 10 points of the call;
- (b) To re-affirm that agreement in principle with these 10 points is the basis of participation in the committee.'

A meeting to constitute the Preparatory Committee will take place on 11th and 12th April 1987 in London.

The WRP wishes to make it clear that once the Preparatory Committee is established, the Committee will be responsible for all arrangements, finance, production of the International Journal, and an International Internal Bulletin to pursue the discussion for clarification of theoretical and political questions leading to and during the International Conference. The WRP will hand over all correspondence and statements to this Committee.

Yours fraternally,

S. Pirani

S. Pirani

On behalf of the Political Committee

(Below is another letter from the WRP making further demands on participants in the London meeting)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION

PO Box 735
London SW9 7QS
Tel: 01-274 7271

April 1, 1987

Dear Comrades,

The first meeting of the Preparatory Committee will take place in central London on Saturday 11th April (starting at 2pm) and Sunday 12th April.

Further to our letter of 23rd March we would remind you of the conditions for participation in the Preparatory Committee agreed by our Political Committee:

"In accordance with the statement of the Central Committee, making the call for the International Conference, we resolve:

(a) To convene a first meeting of the Preparatory Committee of all those who declare agreement in principle with the ten points of the Call;

(b) To re-affirm that agreement in principle with these ten points is the basis of participation in the committee."

At its last meeting, our Central Committee passed the following resolution:

"The organisations participating in the Preparatory Committee must be those who recognise themselves and each other as part of the continuity of the Fourth International and the struggle to build Trotskyist organisations.

Agreement on the ten points in the Call is a minimum basis for a discussion among Trotskyists. Our aim must be to set up an international democratic centralist organisation on the foundation of principled and programmatic agreement."

If your organisation agrees with these conditions, please inform us in writing either by post, or in a letter brought to the Preparatory Committee by your delegate.

Please notify us at the above telephone number the time and place of arrival of your delegate. We will make the necessary arrangements to transport the comrade to the meeting.

Yours fraternally,

Conference Secretary

(Below we reprint our response to the WRP's demands)

The Fourth International (rebuilt)
April 5, 1987

To the WRP
To the Conference Secretary

Dear Comrades:

Our International Executive Committee discussed your letter of April 1 during its session on April 4, 1987.

It considers that the conditions posed are acceptable for participation in the Preparations Committee and consequently it accepts them.

A delegation of the International Executive Committee will come to the first meeting on April 11 and 12 in London. For the rendez-vous, we will telephone Wednesday, April 8.

Fraternally,

For the International Executive Committee,

Michael Faure

Michael Faure
Alexis Gavalier
Edward Marx

and Margaret Gurskoff
delegates of the Trotskyist Organization of the USA
(Internal section)

April 12, 1987

(The statement of our international delegation after its participation in the London meeting was refused by the WRP)

DECLARATION

We protest against the various barriers that the Workers Revolutionary Party (WRP) has put up, during the last week, to our participation in the Preparations Committee.

There have been only various and successive oral explanations for these barriers, although written agreements were made.

In addition, it is incorrect to place the comrade and delegate of the Trotskyist Organization, who came to London from the USA on the basis of these written agreements, before an accomplished fact.

A delegation of our International Executive Committee came to London from Paris and found that the Preparations Committee was closed from the beginning.

This is especially surprising because we have been in discussions with the WRP for more than a year on this question (the international conference), and our agreement has been based on common actions on the international level in Great Britain and in Spain.

The WRP must give an explanation for this in writing.

The delegates of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International (rebuilt)

Michael Faure
Alain Cavalier
Edward Wars

M. Faure
Alain Cavalier
Edward Wars

and Margaret Guttshall,
delegate of the Trotskyist Organization of the USA,
fraternal section.

Margaret Guttshall

April 12, 1987

Gorbachev's Promises and the Realities

[Reprinted from *LaAurora*, February 5-11, 1987]

After hesitations and postponements, the Central Committee of the Communist Party (CP) of the USSR assembled its plenum on Gorbachev's reforms. The results neither respond to the expectations of bourgeois commentators, nor to the illusions of sections of the soviet opposition which began to believe in the siren songs intoned by the Kremlin.

Reality can only contradict the illusions of the bourgeoisie and the opposition.

The bourgeoisie, whose "democratic" philanthropism hardly conceals the eagerness with which they eye the USSR's market, sees the present moment as one of a struggle between the conservatism of the apparatus (which aside from bureaucratic has been "socialist") and a new St. George bureaucrat-slayer partisan of liberties (for the bureaucracy and the enterprises). With this summary analysis, which forgets the ferocious struggle that exists between the bureaucracy and the expression of forms of working class organization, they conclude that this plenum of the Soviet CC has shown strong resistances. The ministry of German imperialism, Genscher, has to ask "Europe and the world (capitalist it goes without saying) to believe in Gorbachev." But the question is not one of "conservative resistance." The important thing about the plenum is the unanimity, that is to say, Gorbachev's line is less that of a faction struggling against others, than it is the line of the Stalinist bureaucracy itself. Certainly at any moment, and above all when the mass of workers go into struggle, the "reforms" will lead to factions and confrontations in the bureaucracy. but those who speculate about this aspect of the problem and place it above the activity of the Soviet working class, above its objective interests as a class, are forgetting the other half of the truth about this concrete "reform": that its limits, its rhythms and its methods are determined by the desire of the clique making a turn in the Kremlin to keep the unity, power and privileges of the bureaucracy as the ruling social caste in the country. Plainly, it is this that gives so much energy to the resistance of the apparatus to such measures: the need to remain united.

To motivate Gorbachev's plenum, professor Popov has published an article in Pravda presenting the other side of the resistance, one less interesting to the bourgeoisie and the opposition with its illusions in the new face of Stalinism. In Pravda, Popov less passively accuses the workers themselves of resistance to the plans of the bureaucracy. According to this, the resistance comes from "worse workers," since the new politics will reduce their salary and their social standing "for the benefit of the better workers." The reader knows such

language: the capitalists also say that the "better workers" are interested in the system of free enterprise and competition, and that capitalism only hurts the vagrants, the stupid, ignorant, the debilitated, etc. Popov goes much farther and declares the desire to protect themselves from any "social tensions," is illusory, but repeats that the resistance "could easily be swept away by a movement of the masses." But which ones? It couldn't be clearer: according to Popov, by "the better" against the "worse workers," that is to say, by the "ambitious technicians, the "aggressive" executives, the aristocracy of labor, the accommodating cooperatives and the most "enterprising" farms; the entirety of the Soviet middle class, who are touched by the crises of the accumulation of capital and the alliance with foreign capital, who are in conflict with the industrial and agricultural proletariat in the struggle against social inequality.

Popov is the mouthpiece of his boss, but in Pravda he can bark longer and louder than Gorbachev himself. His articles prove that the reforms are the politics of the Kremlin (and not of "a faction") but that the Kremlin itself wants to support certain factions and social forces openly oriented to the restoration of capitalism and ~~liberty~~ to the rights of the working class.

On the political terrain, Gorbachev announced various lists in the elections of the party, and the cooptation of independents into the administration. In Vienna the ministry of Justice of the USSR announced the reform of the penal code. But that--an important symptom and an opening to use--still doesn't touch on the problem of liberties. When the minister was questioned about the political prisoners, he denied their existence and only admitted to "200 criminals against the state." This same discussion by Gorbachev at the plenum was a gross amalgam of legitimate national rights of the soviet republics, and the abuses of Breznev's local swindler cronies!

Illusions have been thwarted again. According to the reforms, political rights continue to be "crimes against the State, and national rights are qualified as "localism, gathering storm clouds, arrogance... or involving corruption." The workers should not confuse for an instant the Kremlin's "liberalization" of its police tyranny with the aspirations of the workers and farmers for full freedom of action. This will make soviet democracy flower anew on the ruins of the bureaucratic apparatus.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE IN THE UNITED STATES

By Kevin FitzPatrick

This is the second in a series of articles on basic problems of rebuilding the US section of the Fourth International. The first article, "The Origin and Foundation of the Trotskyist Organization," appeared in *Truth* #215, December 1986.

Continuity and the IC

This article is concerned with drawing a balance of the political struggle conducted by the International Committee (IC) in the United States. By this we do not mean the existence of the Workers League (WL) alone, but the whole struggle to maintain the IC's continuity -- the organized continuity of the Fourth International -- in the United States after the break of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) from it in 1963.

"By continuity we mean," states the Central Resolution of the Tenth Congress of the Fourth International, "the entirety of militant reactions against the attempts to liquidate the Fourth International, the successive battles of differentiation, of selection of cadres and leaders, through which the revolutionary program has been maintained and on which the conquest of a world center, based on the founding principles of the Fourth International, was supported." (*The Fourth International* #126, October 1986)

The question of continuity is connected with the prolonged degeneration of the SWP. The founding of the SWP in 1938 represented a *definitive regroupment* of the revolutionary vanguard elements of the American working class -- from the old Communist Party (CP), from the militants of the American Workers Party and the Socialist Party radicalized by the Depression -- on the basis of the fight for the Fourth International. Every step toward this goal, every struggle of political positions and groups, had been intimately connected with all the questions posed on the international arena, thus making the SWP not just a national party, but a conquest of the Fourth International as a whole.

In turn, it was the SWP, with its "Open Letter to Trotskyists Throughout the World," that had inspired the formation of the IC as the organized expression of the fight against Pablo's attempts to destroy the Fourth International.

Today, almost a quarter of a century after the SWP turned its back on this fight, the Barnes leadership openly repudiates the permanent revolution and everything that flows from it.

It is the great historic merit of the IC's struggle in the US that it analyzed and fought against this development, fought to maintain the conquest

that the SWP represented. Thus, it stated in January 1963, in the internal bulletin of the SWP, the stakes of its fight with the SWP leadership: "Their theoretical position is a revisionist one, and if adhered to will lead to the destruction of the SWP as a Trotskyist party." ("Trotskyism Betrayed," excerpts reprinted in *Oppportunism and Empiricism: Documents from the Socialist Labour League*; p.37)

This prognosis has been confirmed by the actual course of events.

In the situation today, the vanguard elements of the American working class, which are concentrated in the organizations calling themselves Trotskyist, must fully assume and fully re-establish the continuity.

Understanding this fight by the IC, its strengths and weaknesses, as well as its eventual insufficiency, are critical for members of the vanguard today. If we wish to go forward, we must learn from those who have preceded us.

The whole existence of our tendency, of the Trotskyist Organization, represents the struggle by the forces who maintained the continuity of the IC (and thus of the Fourth International) to ~~em~~ ~~ph~~ this continuity in the United States. Our analysis of what the SWP meant -- and of the *new definitive regroupment* that must take place on the basis of all the previous gains -- has provided us with a very rich formula: *rebuilding the US section of the Fourth International*.

On the solid foundation of the Fourth International and its program, we have to pull together everything sound out of the splintered and scattered elements produced by the fall of the SWP. Just as Trotsky, Cannon and others had to build the US section of the Fourth International through fierce political struggle, so today we have to *rebuild* it in the same kind of fight, taking up all the experiences undergone since then. Given the concrete circumstances, the organizational conclusion of this rebuilding will be the *Trotskyist Congress*, the clearcut differentiation of the Trotskyist forces.

The IC's Fight

Without the fight by the IC, we would have no basis today for posing the tasks of the rebuilding. Let us emphasize that this fight, which concentrated on saving the SWP for the International, rather than succumbing to the temptation to write it off, was tactically correct and thoroughly principled.

The IC was able, despite an erroneous position on the class nature of the Cuban state, was able to draw out the real significance of the SWP's position on Cuba: abandoning the task of leading the revolution to alien class forces. In turn, this implied abandoning the task of building independent revolutionary parties and, therefore, struck at the very reason for being of the Fourth International.

It also strove to find the theoretical roots of this policy. With all its defects and excesses, the attempt to carry out Trotsky's plea for study of the dialectic, this attempt to defend and develop the theory of Marxism, is in fact largely responsible for the continuation of this discussion today, for its not being included with the things the Pabloites sought to throw away.

With its fight, the IC won some of the younger elements who were revitalizing the SWP (Tim Wohlforth, James Robertson), as well as older militants like the people around Art Fox and some Minneapolis comrades.

In this context of fighting to save the SWP, we can discern the significance of the split in the original pro-IC tendency. Aside from any other questions, Wohlforth and Robertson represented, respectively, a desire to continue the IC's course versus a desire to abandon this difficult battle and seek an "independent" existence after making a fight that would, so to speak, "make the record."

Over the years, one of the most important elements of the attack on the IC's role has been the nasty little pamphlet, *Healy Reconstructs the Fourth International*, edited and with an introduction by the late Joseph Hansen -- with the collaboration of the Spartacist League (SL), the split led by Robertson, which saw to it that Hansen got the documents and later widely distributed the resulting product. The name of Harry Turner, who was at that time one of the key leaders of the SL, is highly prominent in this pamphlet. (Comrade Turner is now head of the International Socialist League, a US organization linked to the International Workers League of the late Nahuel Moreno.)

Having later been expelled from the SL, Turner was able to relate the actual history of the events. Writing in the publication of the group he then headed, Turner helped to unmask Robertson: "The internal perspectives document by Robertson and Ireland, 'The Centrism of the SWP and the Tasks of the Minority,' which precipitated the break with the IC, has not a word to say about the relationship and responsibility of the tendency to an *internationally* organized struggle. Its focus is narrow and myopic. Its tactics are limited to the immediate tasks of the tendency within a *national* framework. Not an inkling exists that the tendency in the US, comprising a few dozen members at best, was directly con-

nected to *paris*, to the SLL in England and to then-named Organisation Communiste Internationaliste (OCI), which represented thousands of Trotskyists in their own sections, and who in addition, had the responsibility for organizing a struggle in the other national sections of the world movement."

The most that Turner could raise questions about on this point, as well as on the matter of the conditions laid down by the IC in response to Robertson's perspective, was that: "Unfortunately, the tactics pursued by Wohlforth and Healy not only failed to expose Robertson's 'essence' but instead played into his hands." (*Vanguard Newsletter*, October 1970; "Trotskyism Today," Part II, "The Split in the SWP Left Tendency"; emphasis in original)

Thus, the IC had at this juncture, by fighting so hard for the defense of everything the SWP meant, laid the groundwork for taking up the question of rebuilding the US section of the Fourth International, since it was obvious that its tendency's time to pursue its fight within the SWP was growing short. But, at the very moment of its expulsion, what would become the WL (at that time called the American Committee for the Fourth International) abandoned this perspective.

A Confusion

Aside from any other factors, we believe that this turn flowed from an erroneous assessment by the SLL (that is, Healy) of what was at stake. As our comrade Anibal Ramos has pointed out, it was characteristic of Healy and Lambert to decide that certain centrist betrayals actually constituted "definitively going over to the side of the bourgeois order." (*The Fourth International* #127, January 1987; "Lambert's Method") In this way, it was possible to *write off* certain organizations and, while not ceasing to make verbal attacks, to actually retreat from the political struggle against them. Healy explicitly called the 1964 entry of the LSSP (Lanka Sama Samaja Party -- "Ceylon Equal Society Party") into the bourgeois coalition "the greatest betrayal in the history of Trotskyism." And it is just at this point that we can see the tendency in the SWP moving away from its old perspective, for example, in demanding a discussion -- precisely on Ceylon -- while being fully aware that the SWP leadership would seize on this action in order to expel them.

Likewise, the SLL was then finally emerging from the Labour Party, and Healy may have seen the gains created by "independent activity" as a model for the UDS group as well -- given the nascent radicalization in the US in 1964, this would certainly have appealed to Wohlforth and others -- without considering that it was the SLL's fight for Trotskyist principles, which had made it into the recognized center of continuity in Britain, that had really made these gains possible.

As our comrade Alain Cavalier has put it: "...The British section itself took up a serious political battle with a principled policy on the reunification question. If one examines the place of each section of the International Committee in the years 1953 to 1963, it is incontestable that the British section's was fundamental and that it permitted important successes on the national terrain...It was the International Committee's framework that gave this new strength to the SLL." (*The Fourth International* #127, January 1987; "Lambert's Four Confessions")

This is the case despite the problem of federalism within the IC, for example, the passive attitude of the French organization on the Cuban question; the OCI only making its documents on Cuba public in a 1979 (?) issue of its magazine, *Le Part*.

But this problem arose all the more with the growing withdrawal of the WL from confronting the question of the SWP's continuity. Without going into the detailed consideration it deserves, it is clear that Wohlforth's pamphlet, *The Struggle for Marxism in the United States*, was written as a *conclusion* to the struggle in the SWP, not as a continuation of it. It writes "R.I.P." over it and says, "The SWP is dead, long live the WL!" And this document, as Wohlforth testifies is his introduction to the 1971 second edition, was created under the direct influence of the SLL: "In fact, the study which led to writing it was initiated after discussions in England in February 1964. The bulk of the book itself was completed later the same year."

For the SLL, then, the existence of the WL solved the problem of the SWP. The OCI, on the other hand, regarded the WL as marginal and continued to view the SWP as "the Trotskyist organization" in the US -- while doing nothing about it. This lack of political struggle and centralization led to the adoption, by the 1966 Third Conference of the IC, of the SLL's position on the nature of the WL's fight. Thus, the Report of the American Commission (in the pamphlet, *Rebuilding the Fourth International*) says: "The American Committee of [sic -KF] the Fourth International must immediately begin work on the drafting of a perspective for the construction of a revolutionary party in the USA. This would include a concretization as elaborated by Trotsky for the formation of a Labor Party. It must concretize demands in relation to our work in the anti-war in Vietnam movements, the Trade Union and Negro movements. This perspectives document would include an economic analysis of US capitalism in relation to world imperialism."

All this, but not so much as a mention of the SWP.

This weakness stands *in contrast* to the general dynamic and overall character of the 1966 Conference. Basing themselves on the experiences of

the fight since 1953, and especially in the fight for the SWP, the members of this Conference were able to mark two major advances: the first was the self-awareness of being the outcome of the long fight against Pabloism for the maintenance of the Fourth International; the second, that this step demanded completely overcoming the past by advancing toward the rebuilding of the Fourth International.

Thus, the Resolution on the Tasks of the IC states: "The historical continuity of the Fourth International founded in 1938 by Leon Trotsky, reformed in the years 1943-46, which Pabloism attempted to destroy in 1950-53, has been maintained since 1953 by the struggle waged by the Trotskyist organizations grouped within the International Committee." And, therefore: "The International Conference stresses that the Trotskyist movement, in the course of the struggle to build the International, works towards the creation of a centralized leadership of the world revolutionary party...The proceedings of the Third Conference emphasize the necessity for the International Committee to prepare within 18 months the Fourth International Conference, whose aim will be to rally all Trotskyist organizations fighting for the program of the Fourth International."

Likewise, the Manifesto of the Conference states: "The Third Conference of the International Committee...is part of the continuity of the Fourth International. The IC has become the axis and the motive force of the rebuilding of the Fourth International as the centralized proletarian leadership...The Third Conference of the IC marks the victory won against the attempts of Pabloite revisionism to destroy the program and the historical continuity of the Fourth International. It took up the fight against the groups which tried to use the crisis of the Fourth International to jeopardize its program and its method. The struggle for the method and the program of the Fourth International carried out by the IC enables it to undertake the new tasks of rebuilding the Fourth International as the centralized proletarian leadership. This is the stage opened by the Third Conference of the International Committee." (Both documents are contained in the pamphlet, *Rebuilding the Fourth International*; the Resolution on Tasks has also been reprinted in *The Fourth International* #127, January 1987)

There is a contradiction present in the Conference's work; the overwhelming weight of its decisions point in a direction that is not in harmony with the specific decision on the US. Unfortunately, it was this specific policy that was actually being carried out in the practical activity of the WL, criticizing the SWP in words, while really seeking to build itself "independently," in a truly organizational sense.

The final conclusion to these difficulties would not be reached until the stage of the movement represented by the IC had been transcended by the actual rebuilding. Our ability to hold the Fourth Conference, and to mark this rebuilding by transforming it into the Fourth Congress of the International, was what enabled us to perceive these past problems and to overcome them with our perspective of the rebuilding of the US section. But that would never have been possible without the Third Conference itself, with all its weaknesses.

The WL and Its Problems

This immense political significance of the Third Conference was what led Joseph Hansen to particularly attack it in *Healy Reconstructs...* One of the major aspects of this attack has always been the sad tale of how badly Robertson was treated at the Conference, with the SL itself taking the part of chief mourner.

Here again, Harry Turner provides a corrective. "Joseph Hansen, Robertson's self-appointed defense counsel, is aghast that an 'exhausted' Robertson, who is 'near collapse,' can be summarily ordered to return to a session of the Conference. What abominable bureaucratic brutality!! But, a careful examination of all the facts in the affair Robertson presents an entirely different picture. Robertson, whatever his state of health prior to the Conference, ~~is~~ tired, and with good reason. He had lost a night's sleep in a last minute attempt at whipping together a draft document which was to be the basis upon which the Spartacist and ACFI groups were to be united, and which should have been completed months earlier. But that doesn't end the matter.

"On the third day of the Conference, Robertson had presented his divergent views, including his position on Cuba, *for the first time* before a world gathering of co-thinkers. But he, evidently, did not consider it worthwhile to stay for the afternoon session, in which delegates were able to react to the reports and exchange views. No! Robertson decided that this would be the ideal time for a nap! When awakened by another Spartacist delegate with a request to attend the Conference session, he bluntly refused to stir himself and returned to sleep.

"Is it any wonder then, that his demeanor was found to be arrogant and disrespectful to the Conference?..."

"With the prospects for unity with ACFI gone glimmering, one could have expected that Robertson, on returning home, would first have called a meeting of...the political committee of the national organization... But no! Instead, Robertson called a special meeting of the NYC [New York City] ~~the~~ organization to hear his report.

"In the course of a five-part report, lasting almost three hours, the audience was also informed of an incident of which his attorney, Joseph Hansen, had not been told.

"It seems that just prior to his expulsion, Robertson and the Spartacist delegation had been called to a special meeting with Healy and Mike Banda...They had, at that time, offered 'to work something out.' It was *Robertson* who refused to consider a rapprochement, who "just wanted to get out of there." Somewhat amazed, and not quite certain that I had heard him correctly, I cross-questioned him and was again informed that it was, indeed, Robertson who had made the decision to break off relations with the IC. Only after that did Healy call for his expulsion from the Conference." (*Vanguard Newsletter*, February 1971; "Trotskyism Today," Part V, "The 1966 London Conference and Its Aftermath"; emphasis in original)

Thus, the WL was now, from 1966 on, faced with a difficult situation. It was a small group faced with larger competitors (the SWP, and even the SL), and was a working class group trying to develop its policy in a period in which the radicalization -- especially in these first years -- would have a markedly petty bourgeois character. In this situation, the lack of a correct orientation toward the problems of the Fourth International in the United States -- that is, toward the SWP -- would critically impede its work.

In his book, *The History of American Trotskyism*, James P. Cannon outlined the problem that faced the WL just as surely (even if in a different manner) as it had faced the pioneer American Trotskyists: "If the group misunderstands the tasks set for it by the conditions of the day, if it does not know how to answer the most important of all questions in politics -- that is, the question of what to do next -- then the group, no matter what its merits may otherwise be, can wear itself out in misdirected efforts and futile activities, and come to grief..."

"Of course, you have to find a road to the masses in order to create a party that can lead a revolution. But the road to the masses leads through the vanguard and not over its head."

But the WL, as we have seen, had in practice rejected this policy and was directing its very limited efforts to the working class in general, regarding the SWP as solely a dead past.

Thus, the WL had no real impact on the SWP, appearing only as a group of fringe critics. In particular, in the 1971 crisis of the SWP -- in which there emerged all the forces that for the next period, 1971-76, would represent any kind of working class opposition to the SWP leadership -- the WL had virtually no contact with and no in-

fluence over these militants. This went so far that the WL had to send several of its locally isolated militants into the SWP on the eve of the explosion, where they played the role strictly of loyal supporters of the tendency presenting the document, "For a Proletarian Orientation."

The upshot of this inadequacy was that the WL, with the temporary exception of one or two individuals, gained nothing from this development. In fact, the SL gained much more in an organizational sense, while a whole layer of others fell into the arms of the old Pabloite majority within the United Secretariat and were lost forever to politics with the crushing (by Barnes) and the betrayal (by Mandel) of the Internationalist Tendency.

Parallel with this isolation, there developed a sectarian behavior toward the radicalizing youth. This was manifested in two particular ways.

First, the WL made no attempt (ironically, neither did the SWP) to intervene in the largest radical student organization that ever existed in this country -- indeed, one of the largest in the world -- the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Instead, this current was left open to the machinations of the Maoist-Fosterite Stalinists of the Progressive Labor Party (PLP). Within a few years, despite its opportunist and sectarian policies, PLP was a critical force in SDS. When SDS blew up in 1969, once again whole layers of youth disappeared forever from the struggle.

Secondly, the WL abstained from a political struggle within the movement against the war in Vietnam. Facing the domination of that movement by radical petty bourgeois forces, ultimately linked to the Democratic Party, and the important role played by the SWP in preserving and deepening that character, the WL simply reacted with a policy of denunciation of the movement as a popular-front type formation. To the mobilizations of millions in this mass movement, it counterposed its own actions and "contingents" that literally led the most advanced elements out of the actions and into self-satisfied isolation. This second policy in particular is directly connected with writing off the SWP and pretending that all that mattered was the "independent" activity of the WL.

Our international tendency long ago pointed out that one of the weaknesses of the old IC was the problem of the "historic chiefs." This vestige of the Pabloite crisis -- the overriding importance of the leader's prestige -- was intensified by national isolation in the period of federalism. This was manifested in the WL in the vast inflation of the importance of one such "chief," Gerry Healy of the SLL, to the detriment of the development of a natural leadership. Tim Wohlforth, the founding leader of the WL, was himself seriously marked by this problem. He himself became another such "chief," although on a smaller scale. At

the same time, this artificial prestige was ultimately dependent on Healy.

Anyone who saw Wohlforth's public behavior in that period recalls it with repulsion -- and this was the face of the WL, something that could in no way inspire respect, interest or enthusiasm from critically seeking youth of the 60s. This was ultimately highly damaging to the IC's fight in the US.

Let us be clear; this is not a personal denunciation of Wohlforth (who was virtually dragooned into abandoning his own positions on the nature of the deformed workers states -- "The Theory of Structural Assimilation"; see analysis in *Truth* #3, November 1974 -- and on the Black question in the US, for example, by Healy), but the fact is that there is a very close connection between the nature of an organization and the nature of its leadership.

Thus, when Wohlforth was driven out of the WL by Healy amid the origins of the slander campaign, the International League (precursor of the rebuilt Fourth International) and the Trotskyist Organization attempted to discuss with him and to win him to our perspectives. He rejected this opportunity for the promises of Hansen and joined the SWP. When this, as we predicted, proved utterly fruitless, he left political activity. In the last period he has become an open anti-Leninist, writing articles entitled "After the Revolution" (in the British radical magazine *New Left Review* #230, July-August 1981) and "The Two Souls of Leninism" (in *Against the Current*, September-October 1986; the magazine of the American group "Solidarity," composed of Shachtmanites and others).

Despite all these great weaknesses, the WL did make (especially in the period 1970-73) very real and visible advances. By the hard persistent work of carrying the IC's fight into the American working class, it had major accomplishments to its credit. In particular, this involved a considerable popularization of the Labor Party slogan.

At this time, the WL began a large recruitment of youth, especially among Blacks and other minorities, and of trade unionists. In this way, it actually began to have an impact in the unions and in the working class communities. And the expansion and development of *The Bul*, the WL's paper, was part and parcel of this advance.

One particular aspect of this period should be noted. In the spring of 1973, the WL held a series of public forums around the topic, "Twenty Years of the International Committee" (see *The Bul* from April 23 through June 14, 1973). In contrast to past policy, the SL was admitted to these meetings and was actually given floor-time to defend its views -- Robertson, for example, got a full half-hour on one occasion. In this way, the

WL (even with hesitations) began to see that building a vanguard in the working class demands an open debate. The fact that this debate can only help the revolutionaries is illustrated by the feebleness of the SL's intervention. For example, one SL member announced: "Marx was profoundly anti-philosophical. That's why Marx wrote a book called *The Poverty of Philosophy* ""!

We said at the beginning of this article that the question of the WL could not be separated from that of the IC. Thus, even in the midst of this positive turn in the Us, the WL was being undermined by developments in that sphere. In 1971, Gerry Healy organized the split of the IC, retreating into national isolation from the decisive challenges posed by the 1966 Conference and the period itself.

In politics as in nature, the flower can maintain its blossom even though it has been cut off at the roots -- for a while. Eventually, it withers before your eyes.

The split of 1971 sabotaged the WL's advance. Even the public forums were in part aimed at justifying the split with the OCI. What was really happening was the intensification of the national isolation of the WL, while at the same time it was under the influence of the British organization. This resulted, in combination with the advances cited above, in the intensification of the "independent" fight of the WL, summed up in the slogan, "Build the Workers League!"

Retreating farther and faster from the IC, Healy began to see the WL itself (the largest of the groups outside Britain) as a potential danger to his policy. In a pattern that he would increasingly follow elsewhere later, Healy let the national leadership take the blame for the abuses and erroneous policies increasingly imposed -- in the name of "IC discipline" -- by these leaders on the WL. In this way, Wohlforth was left hanging in mid-air, blamed by the members for the policies he was under compulsion to carry out. Following an outbreak of violence at the WL 1974 summer camp, Healy seized on this opportunity and rapidly drove Wohlforth out of the leadership and out of the organization.

This was the beginning of the slander campaign that would extend from Wohlforth and his wife, Nancy Fields, to Joseph Hansen and George Novack of the SWP for defending them, to the Barnes leadership of the SWP for supporting Hansen and Novack -- until it became a full-scale substitute for any kind of political struggle inside and outside the Healy "IC" groupings.

The results of this campaign have been the purging of the WL, especially, of the painfully accumulated cadres it had won in the past, to discredit it -- and the whole history of the IC -- in the

eyes of militants. The WL has turned into a group that actually *protects* Barnes & Co. politically. If the "real" explanation for their policies is that they are "spies," what use could it possibly be to argue against their views, to fight out the meaning of the permanent revolution and other questions today among the oppositionists in the SWP and other tendencies? To do that would only be to cover up their role as "spies." So goes the insane logic of slander.

A Conclusion

But even the WL finds itself under pressure to meet today's demands. Thus, we interpret its recent (*The Bulletin*; March 27, 1987) characterization of us as "centrist" as a *defensive* reaction by the North leadership to the political struggle we have already carried out with the WL. We cannot be turned aside by labels -- still less by empty ones.

The discussion now involves virtually every organization. This article is part of our continuing contribution to it and is part of clarifying all the questions of Trotskyism in this country. That is the road, supported by common action, that will lead to once again creating a single, definitive Trotskyist party in the United States.

Rebuild the US Section of the Fourth International!

SMOT

SMOT Free General Workers Union Free Trade Union in the USSR, founded in 1978 in Moscow
5, rue Thomas-Couture 95400 Villiers-le-Bel France
April 1, 1987

**To comrades of the Ligue Ouvriers
Revolutionnaire De France**

Dear Friends and Comrades of SMOT,

A short message to tell you that FINKEL and his family have received authorization to leave the USSR.

Monday, March 30, FINKEL planned to leave a last time, given his health, to demonstrate before the Pansoviet Bureau of the OVIR, to demand the right to emigrate, having been on a hunger strike since last February 16. Friday, March 27, FINKEL received a call from the OVIR, inviting him to come Monday, March 30, at 2 o'clock. This was the hour planned for the demonstration. FINKEL decided to go to the OVIR after the demonstration; the employee who received him indicated that it was impossible for him and his family to leave the USSR since his brother, Vadim FINKEL, had recently begun his military service. That is to say, a meaningless pretext. That evening his telephone was cutoff and we were unable to find out the result of the interview with the OVIR as we had planned. Then, Tuesday, March 31, yesterday, FINKEL's phone was suddenly reconnected and the head of OVIR central told him to forget what he had said the day before, that he and his family could leave the USSR. FINKEL thus ended the hunger strike yesterday; his sister, Lilia, who was on strike with him, is in a very disturbing state. Coming out of the hunger strike, she is unable to swallow, to get anything down, is suffering from spasms of the larynx; she was hospitalized on an emergency basis today, and finds herself fed intravenously. FINKEL cannot eat normally, for he also has spasms, but of the stomach (which is less disturbing), and can only drink juice for the moment.

The Soviet authorities have thus waited to the last extremity to give in. Many of you have sent telegrams and aerograms.

We thank you with all our heart for having reacted. Thank you for bringing around you people that we might not have reached.

We ask you at the present time to concentrate, with respect to SMOT, on Vladimir GUER-CHOUNI, who said (a telephone conversation, Friday, March 27) that he would like to go to the West, on the invitation of a union, to one of its Congresses. (We remind you that we have for your disposition the formula issued by the Consulate of the USSR, which could be sent directly to the psychiatric hospital to which he has just

been transferred.) We remind you of KOUKOBKA's request, who is now in the VITEBSK prison, and ask that an invitation be sent directly to him at the prison. (Events are changing rapidly at the moment in the USSR, we think that our comrades know better than we to what extent their demand is real) Finally, we ask you not to forget two comrades, SKOBOV and SITYNSKI, recently transferred from a psychiatric hospital to a psychiatric prison in Leningrad. They ask that we do not forget them. Send aerograms. And do not forget KLEBANOV either.

We propose to you to remain in close communication.

Thank you for your fidelity and effectiveness.

Fraternal greetings,

V. Borisov

V. Fainberg Representatives abroad of SMOT

O. Raynaud Secretary of the SMOT Association

Class Struggle in America

March 29

On March 29, 5,000 young people, militants and workers marched through downtown Detroit demanding that the US stay out of Central America. It was the largest demonstration in years in Detroit; certainly the largest against US policy in Central America. Particularly interesting was the presence of numbers of high school students from suburban Detroit high schools such as Plymouth, Southfield, Troy as well as from Detroit Renaissance High school.

In addition to the Trotskyist Organization, there were at least three other organizations advocating Reagan's impeachment -- Women for Impeachment, the U.S. Peace Council, the Ann Arbor solidarity group, Latin American Solidarity Committee who carried individual letters that read "Impeach Reagan" on one side and "For His Crimes" on the other. We sold over 150 Impeach Reagan buttons.

In spite of endorsements, the absence of UAW contingents or other union contingents indicates what we have said many times before: the ranks must be mobilized.

And we insist and continue to insist that it is only with a working class front -- all working class organizations to join in a common front to stop US intervention in Central America and mobilize the working class around this goal. This still remains the only means by which the contradiction between the mobilization of the workers, the endorsements of union leaders and locals, and the absence of any mass organized working class presence in the anti-intervention actions can be resolved.

The Chicago Elections

Harold Washington was re-elected mayor of Chicago on April 7. At the last minute, Thomas Hynes, a racist Democrat running against Washington, withdrew from the race increasing the possibility that Ed Vrdolyak, the other racist Democrat, would win. But it failed to work.

The working class struggle did not advance in this election. The SWP campaign was formal, a candidate, without even the ballot effort (a write-in). There was no mobilization at all for a Labor candidate for mayor by the working class organizations. An opportunity for intervening decisively in the crisis of the DP was missed.

And this crisis is real. The open question posed by even bourgeois political reporters, hardly the brightest people around, was, "no matter who wins, what will happen to the Democratic Party in Illinois?" Dan Rostenkowski, an important Congressman from Illinois, went out of his way to en-

dorse Vrdolyak only a few weeks before the election.

In spite of this, the opportunity to advance exists. In the upcoming presidential elections, the existing fractures in the Democratic Party will be opened even more sharply. A struggle for Labor Candidates can really advance in Chicago.

UAW Bargaining Convention

Speaking of Chicago, the UAW top leadership, in fear of having its Bargaining Convention overwhelmed by autoworkers, went to Chicago to discuss the upcoming contracts with GM and Ford.

The convention was replete with its usual blustering calls for "war" with GM and tough talk; demonstrations for the slogans of the bureaucracy. And of course, no real strategy for winning in the fall.

Nevertheless, the splits in the leadership were evident. There was a demonstration for a national strike of GM, certainly something that the top leadership would love to avoid. A national strike of auto opens up the possibility for the autoworkers to advance against the corporations and against the collaborators in their own union.

The top leadership has endorsed a number of local strikes in order to vent some steam and to test how far the ranks want to go against GM. The leadership is developing its support for Democrats in the upcoming elections. Finally, the UAW as a whole endorsed the April 25 March. This action was positive. But, from the point of view of the leadership, it represented an attempt to maintain control over the anti-intervention movement and prevent its linking up with the movement in the working class against plant closings, the attacks on immigrant workers, etc.

Right now, all efforts must be concentrated on: the national strike of auto, for control of the strike and its demands by the ranks; and, the struggle for a Labor Candidate in 1988. This is the struggle that can link the anti-intervention movement and the struggle of the workers.

US Supreme Court Ruling

The US Supreme Court, in its most vicious attack on Blacks in years, sustained the death sentence for a Black, even though the Court admitted that Blacks are much more likely to be sentenced to death than whites.

Each individual will have to prove that racial discrimination played a role in his case. And, if none of them do, (and it will be very difficult for them) then we will be confronted with the reality of a racist sentencing system but no single Black person was discriminated against! Truly Or-

wellian doublespeak. Racial discrimination in general, but equality in all the individual cases.

This decision shows the racist character of the current Supreme Court and the Reagan administration that appointed its majority. It also shows that Black people will less and less be able to seek redress of their grievances through the courts. The class struggle is deepening in the US, and the courts are revealing the true face as hangmen for the bourgeoisie.

Jim and Tammy

All the hullabaloo around Jim Bakker from PTL (Praise the Lord, People That Love and now Pass the Loot), is a further evidence of the current crises of the radical right. The ministers -- Swagert, Falwell, Bakker, Roberts -- have been unable to keep the revelations of their mansions, big cars and exotic life styles out of the pages of the newspapers. They have had to carry out a "holy war" with each other over money, directorship of PTL, etc. The scandal associated with this has already resulted in decreased contributions. Bakker and his wife Tammy may be washed up for good. But the others will continue with their poisonous doctrines. Nevertheless, it has been refreshing to see their decadence spread all over the paper. It will, to be sure, have a salutary effect on young people and that is worth its weight in gold.

Hoffman-Carter Trial

Abbie Hoffman, famous radical from the 60's (one of the original founders of the Yippies) and Amy Carter, daughter of former president Jimmy Carter, were arrested and later acquitted for attempting to block CIA recruiters on Amy's campus.

What is important here is that, in spite of all the publicity, they were acquitted and no defense of the CIA was forthcoming from the Democrats, or from her father. This serves to further isolate the government from students and young people, and further emboldens their actions.

LA 8

The eight Palestinians arrested in Los Angeles for violation of the McCarran-Walter Act (belonging to an organization that advocates the violent overthrow of the government, in this case the Front for the Liberation of Palestine) has entered a new stage.

First, a position paper of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) was leaked to the press. As reported on National Public Radio, this document outlines preparing such a test case as this in order to move against political immigrants in general. Secondly, and this pertains directly to this case, if it appears that a mobilization to free them may develop around prosecuting them with political charges, that is under this McCarthyite law, then the INS is to move to prosecuting

them for passport violations. This is a technical charge which is hardly ever enforced except when its useful to the INS; it is non-political as well. And this is exactly what the INS has done.

This case should remain in the spotlight particularly with these maneuvers by the government. All charges must be dropped immediately!

FRENCH STUDENT LEADER SPEAKS IN DETROIT

On Wednesday, April 22, David Assoulinethe elected national spokesman of the French student strike of last fall, spoke in Detroit at Wayne State University.

The event was significant in that it was financed by the Student Council, in order to help bring the lessons of the French students' movement to American students in their struggles against cut-backs and other attacks. Earlier in the day, Assouline spoke to the Student Council itself, getting a warm reception, and several members of that body attended the evening talk.

As we have often stated, David Assouline is a leading member of the French section of the Fourth International. Thus, our organization invited all the political tendencies claiming to be Trotskyist to come to this meeting, to speak and to have a literature table. The Revolutionary Workers League (RWL) and the Workers League (WL) accepted this offer, while a number of ~~SP~~ supporters also came to the meeting. All together, there was an audience of well over thirty persons. The presentation produced a great deal of enthusiasm, and a lively period of questions and discussion followed.

In particular, the representative of the WL intervened to denounce our international organization as "centrist," on the grounds that since Stalinism was the great danger in France, we were covering up for it by not denouncing the Morenoist MAS in Argentina, which is in an alliance with the Communist Party there. The reason for this silence was that the British WRP was moving close to the Morenoist current internationally, and we were trying to reach an agreement with the WRP; thus, "centrism": *Q.E.D.*

Comrade Assouline responded on the actual struggle against Stalinism and Social Democracy that his role in the student strike required and pointed out the rather strained logic of the WL intervention, as well as its lack of a method that facilitated open discussion.

A Response to Weinstein's "Anti-Vietnam War movement gives vital lessons for today"

In the March issue of *Socialist Action*, newspaper of Socialist Action, a group of expelled SWP oppositionists, there is an important article called "Anti-Vietnam War movement gives vital lessons for today." It is sub-titled "The united front in action."

The lessons of the anti-Vietnam war movement and the attitude of organizations claiming to be Trotskyist to the nascent movement against US intervention in Central America are obviously linked. The policy for this movement, that is, for the anti-imperialist movement in the world center for imperialism, is a fundamental question for the rebuilding of the US section of the Fourth International. Because of this fact, all the oppositions from the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), Socialist Action (SA), the Fourth Internationalist Tendency (FIT), Solidarity, are defining themselves in relation to the policy of the SWP in the anti-war movement which, more than any other question, trained SWP militants of the 60's.

Nat Weinstein, a leader of the Socialist Workers Party for many years and currently a leader of Socialist Action, writes this article as a polemic, without mentioning names, of all the organizations that claim Trotskyism and are to the left of the Socialist Workers Party.

It is an attempt at claiming the positive heritage of the SWP in the 60's. But the positive aspects of that heritage -- the principled struggle for a single concrete principled demand -- Out Now! -- and a mass mobilization against the Vietnam War -- are not fought for in today's movement by either Socialist Action or the Socialist Workers Party.

The struggle for this positive contribution, along with overcoming the weaknesses of that struggle, is an essential part of rebuilding of the U.S. Section of the Fourth International.

What Policy does Weinstein advocate?

The policy advocated by Weinstein and implemented by Socialist Action today is not policy of the SWP in the 60's. It is, rather, the weakest aspects of that policy as they were developed by the SWP through the late 60's and '70s. It is a policy more akin to the policy of the SWP today in the anti-intervention movement.

The policy of the SWP in the early 60's, was in part a political battle in the movement against the pacifists and Stalinist attempts to limit the movement, to weaken its mass character. Some of this comes out clearly in the book "Out Now" by Fred Halsted (an SWP leader, especially in the anti-Vietnam war movement).

This agreement between Socialist Action and the SWP's current policy is the reason that there is no discussion of the SWP's role in the movement today. This, in spite of the fact that SA split from the SWP over its rejection of Trotskyism. But if the fundamental questions of Trotskyism have any meaning today, than it is in the movement against US intervention in Central America.

As we stated in our series on the Halsted book (*Truth* Nos. 130-131, May 1981): "The policy of the SWP in the 1960's was a policy of pressure on imperialism, of 'peaceful protest,' of reform, of national isolation from the world revolution."

This is why, in one of the few places when the policy as a policy was discussed, it is advocated as a change over the Trotskyist policy of the SWP in the 40's. (Political Committee report 6/25/65, reprinted in *Revolutionary Strategy in the Fight Against the Vietnam War*).

This policy is completely different from the Trotskyist policy. A Trotskyist policy fights for a powerful mass mobilization of all sectors of the society against imperialist war. And above all, a mass mobilization against imperialism bases itself on the mobilization of the working class in an independent manner. And the movement can build itself only to the extent that the working class participation grows, to the extent that the working class participates independently. Thus, the movement against imperialism is based on a fight in the working class for a Labor Party.

In the anti-intervention movement today, the SWP is deepening its anti-Trotskyist turn of 1980. It seeks, more than ever, accommodation with the liberals, pacifist and religious organizations, the organizations most isolated and antagonistic to the working class in the movement. In other words, in the name of revolutionary Marxism, the SWP carries out a very similar policy to that of the Communist Party (CP), the advocates of Stalinist policies in the American working class.

The examples are numerous. When the Cleveland Conference was held, it was the SWP among the revolutionary Marxists who opposed the only democratic conference held in years and one with a strong response from the trade unions (as did national CISPES and of course the CP). The SWP did not fight the lack of any mobilizations during the election years of '82, '84, '86 with any united front policy, with any effort to mobilize the activists that supported such actions. The CP argued that the working class and the anti-intervention movement should support the Democrats as a "lesser evil." Along with the CP, it gave into national CISPES, the pacifists and religious groups.

The Communist Party is the most accommodationist to the anti-working class forces, even establishing front groups such as the U.S. Peace Council to operate in these milieus. And precisely because the CP was against a powerful mass mobilization in the 60's and remains against it in the 80's, it opposes a Labor Party. The CP's principal policy -- one that it has consistently maintained since Roosevelt -- is subordination of the working class to the Democratic Party, one of the twin parties of imperialism.

The results of this accommodation? The bourgeois liberals remain in control of the movement; the movement remains undemocratic; the unions remain poorly mobilized against intervention in Central America.

Not only is there no counterposition between the strongest, broadest mobilization against US imperialism and the independent mobilization of the working class, but it is increasingly clear that only with the independent mobilization of the working class can the movement really deepen its strength and support.

What Happened to the Anti-Vietnam War Movement?

The movement of the youth and the working class, coupled with the victories of the NLF, forced the US out of Vietnam. As Weinstein says, "the rest is history."

But what was "the rest"? Weinstein points out that the ruling class averted a serious crisis by pulling out of Vietnam.

"This move to make the workers begin paying for the war had profound potential consequences, ultimately threatening to bring the heavy battalions of the working class, despite the bureaucracy, into the struggle. Had the U.S. capitalist government not withdrawn from Vietnam, its crisis could have grown to near-revolutionary proportions.

"But the development of mass consciousness was only slowed down."

How could the US ruling "avert a serious crisis" by handing the workers and oppressed of the world a powerful victory? What situation existed in the working class leadership that a victory became not a step from which to advance but an obstacle to be overcome?

It must be stated first, in disagreement with Weinstein, that the working class did enter the field of battle -- the GM strike of 1970 (67 days long); the wildcat strike of postal workers; the sit-down strikes in Detroit; the formation of the League of Revolutionary Black Workers.

It was the political policy of the SWP, principally, as the main party claiming Trotskyism, that al-

lowed the opportunities that flowed from this victory to slip through the working class's fingers.

The SWP Oppositions in the 60's and 70's

The struggle against the accommodation to Stalinism by the SWP played a key role in the development of oppositions to the SWP leadership in the late 60's and 70's, and, in light of their own development, is important to SA militants.

First, the anti-war movement provided new forces to the SWP. The SWP in the early 60's had just broken with the Fourth International (the International Committee) and reunited with the anti-Trotskyist Pabloite forces. It had attracted to it in the 50's some of the finest youth of that generation. Its break with the Fourth International provoked a split in its ranks (see article on the IC in this issue).

Despite Trotsky's discussion with the SWP leadership on the need for a fight for a Labor Party, the leadership did not conduct such a struggle in *The Militant*, -- it did not make any effort toward reaching the trade union ranks and oppositions; it did not develop any orientation toward the radicalizing Black workers.

As the movement grew, youth were attracted to the SWP by its place in the anti-war movement and its Trotskyist banner, both vestiges of its ties to the International Committee. In the late 1960's at a certain point in the struggle it became possible to lead large sections of the youth and the working class away from the Democratic Party toward a Labor Party. (See series on *Out Now* in *Truth*.) The SWP used its political position to subordinate the struggle for working class independence to one wing of a split ruling class, the liberal bourgeoisie that had become against the Vietnam war.

The growing mobilization of the working class had raised the need for working class independence to a imperious demand. This situation was echoed in the ranks of the SWP by the development of three oppositions: the Communist Tendency, the Proletarian Orientation and the Internationalist Tendency.

The oppositions to the SWP's policies all contained planks in their platforms opposing the anti-war policy of the SWP and linking it to the absence of a struggle with the working class. "Out Now" versus "Negotiations" and "Single Issue" versus "Multi-Issue". Thus, Weinstein's avers that the most important lessons for the movement today concern the struggle between "Out Now" and "Negotiations," and "Single Issue" and "Multi-Issue." But these debates miss the question of the working class.

First, it is necessary to say that the SWP today defends "Negotiations" as a slogan. Second, that

the slogan "Out Now" concentrated a struggle against pacifist and Stalinist elements which wanted a place for US intervention in Vietnam with the slogan of "Negotiations." Today we see all sorts of slogans raised which are concessions to imperialism in the same way -- "Stop the War" and "Peace" in Central America, "Support the Contadora Process," etc.

But, fundamentally, the dispute over slogans does not answer the question posed by the events that followed. Namely, that when the Vietnamization of the war began in 1973, the movement disappeared.

As Fred Halsted wrote in *Out Now*: "Virtually all the local anti-war coalitions also folded up. In the two years following the signing of the [Paris Peace] accords, then, the American anti-war movement was no longer involved with mass mobilizations."

Why did the movement "fold up"? A section of the bourgeoisie became defeatist on the war in the late 60's and early 70's. The political subordination of the working class and thus of the anti-war movement to the liberal bourgeoisie meant that it was unable to define itself independently of these bourgeois defeatists. Without a policy of revolutionary defeatism, -- that is, in essence, being grateful that the US government was defeated in Vietnam and figuring out how to utilize its defeat for more victories -- the movement folded up.

For the bourgeois defeatists, it was necessary to protect the US government from further attacks -- Blacks at home, the trade unions, etc., by dissolving the anti-war movement. Instead of taking advantage of a split in the ruling class to advance the workers, the working class found itself subordinate to one wing of the bourgeoisie.

The other struggle considered fundamental by Weinstein is "multi-issue" versus "single issue" (the war). We think too that a powerful mass mobilization around the demand of US out of Central America or even end all support to the contras requires a struggle against the Stalinists and pacifists who want to tie the movement to the Democratic Party often times through the tactic of diluting the issue. And whenever and wherever SA wishes to make this fight, we will join them wholeheartedly.

But, the more fundamental question is: should those opposed to US intervention be making the link between the imperialist plans of Reagan and the union attacks, between the racist war abroad and racist attacks at home, that is, the struggle for a Labor Party? That question, in practice, Weinstein has answered "no."

In the 60's there could have been candidates of organizations independent of the Democrats and Republicans among working class organizations, coupled with opening up a fight in the trade unions for supporting these candidates -- especially among Blacks, and in the new working class centers of the 70's such as Lordstown, Norwood, and the Chrysler plants in Detroit. The opportunity exists again today.

And Weinstein's position, that such a fight in the working class, or among the radicalizing youth, inevitably leads to support for Democrats, is only true if there is no fight for a Labor Party in the working class. In other words, it is a defensive position in today's political situation. It is the Stalinists and the Democrats who cannot advocate electoral politics openly in the undemocratic coalitions, the movement is already that sophisticated among the youth -- the Democrats are so bankrupt in the society as a whole. And, in spite of this situation, SA resists any united front effort among working class organizations to mobilize the working class against US intervention, any united front effort to struggle in the working class for a Labor Party.

The International Meaning

Finally, it was the self-imposed national isolation of the SWP that prevented it from grasping what was at stake in the late 60's and early 70's. There was a pre-revolutionary situation in Europe -- the French events, the Prague Spring, etc. The American ruling class is more intimately linked to defense of imperialism around the world than any other ruling class. A pre-revolutionary situation was beginning here as well. Even Jack Barnes, as Organizational Secretary of the SWP, admitted it (Report at May 14, 1970 National Committee plenum).

Every blow against US imperialism at home has a double effect -- it weakens it here and internationally, and spurs the peoples of the world to further attack their own ruling classes, all dependent, to a greater or lesser degree, on US imperialism.

This means that today, the anti-intervention movement is watched from around the world. There is a new generation in America coming forward against US imperialism. For it, just like the generation of 1968, the success, the political struggles of this movement are critical.

We are confident that this generation will not make the mistakes of the last generation. It will provide the energy for the rebuilding of the US section of the Fourth International. It will learn the lessons of the 60's -- a political struggle against imperialism and its supporters requires the independent mobilization of the working class -- a Labor Party.

GLOBAL CONFLICT

Nicaragua

At the end of April, Benjamin Linder, an American civilian working as an engineer on a hydroelectric project in Jinotega province, northern Nicaragua, was ambushed and killed by a contra raiding party. The attacks mounted by the Reagan government on the Nicaraguan people and their revolution have now found their first domestic victim -- this is what is called "bringing the war back home."

There is every indication that Linder was killed precisely because he was working on a project that would help relieve the poverty of Nicaragua; he had, indeed, obtained an engineering degree for the sole purpose of using it in Nicaragua.

The death of Benjamin Linder -- anti-intervention activist, internationalist volunteer -- will clarify for many the real nature of what Reagan presents as the "national security" of the United States.

Israel

On February 17, Zionist police closed down the offices of the Alternative Information Center and arrested its leading figure, Michel Warshawsky, a well-known supporter of the "United Secretariat" in Israel. This organization was attacked and suppressed because it published useful, independent information -- used even by the pro-Israel Western news agencies -- on the situation of Palestinians and on other struggles inside the Zionist state. That Warshawsky was charged under the old "prevention of terrorism" act, the legacy of British colonial rule, shows both the "democratic" reality of Israel and what the Zionist authorities regard as "terrorism" -- the dissemination of the truth about their rule.

Canada

In mid-March, at its national convention, the New Democratic Party (NDP), the Canadian labor party, made a major change in policy. After many years of hostility -- and even English-Canadian chauvinism -- toward the rights of French-speaking Quebec province, it came out firmly for the defense of the rights of that province and the oppressed Quebecois people.

This important advance, which will help to unite the workers of all of Canada, came just as the NDP was registering in the public opinion polls as the second most popular party, thus ending the previous political domination of the two capitalist parties, the Liberals and Progressive Conservatives.

China

In the last week of March, the Chinese government announced the conviction of a number of ~~workers~~ for their role in leading and organizing the mass student protests of late 1986 and early

1987. This fact shows all the more clearly the revolutionary and anti-Stalinist character of these actions, as well as the energies that are accumulating for the political revolution in China.

Yugoslavia/Hungary

In early March a series of strikes broke out in Yugoslavia, involving over 10,000 workers. The government threatened to call out the army, but took no actual steps to do so. On March 15, in Hungary, meanwhile, a march of 1,500 oppositionists took place against Russian occupation and for democracy, on the anniversary of the defeated Hungarian Revolution of 1848 -- and reminding everyone of the defeated Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Large numbers of police watched, but made no arrests.

What is significant in both cases is that these two countries are the models and forerunners of the "economic reforms" and so-called "market socialism" already existing in China and now being introduced into the USSR by the Gorbachev leadership. Far from lessening bureaucratic rule and leading to peaceful development, such capitalist measures exacerbate the class struggle and lead to growing opposition to Stalinist rule, the transmission belt for these influences.

South Africa

In recent weeks the tense equilibrium of the last few months in South Africa has been broken. The apartheid regime of Botha sought to consolidate the rule of its Nationalist Party by holding an election for the whites-only legislature. (Indians and "Coloureds" have a collaborationist and powerless legislature set up over them.)

The organizations of the oppressed Black majority (80% of the population), which has no vote and no rights whatsoever, undertook a mass campaign of opposition to this vicious fraud. In this campaign, it was the Black working class and its trade union movement that decisively took the lead -- to the point that even the most obtuse reporters could see that the struggle was taking shape as a working class movement.

The victory of the Nationalist Party, larger than expected, shows that the Afrikaners are embarked on a suicidal course that will mean greater repression, conflict and violence in the coming months, as the South African Revolution matures.

One important development was the call by the African National Congress for whites to "vote against apartheid," a call specifically made by Winnie Mandela, wife of imprisoned ANC leader Nelson Mandela. This act of support to the "liberal" white opposition parties failed wretchedly, demonstrating at one and the same time the futility of the ANC's reformist course and the nature of its Stalinist-created program of democratic revolution first, social revolution...later.