
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**

TROTSKYIST CONGRESS! REBUILD THE U.S. SECTION

INSIDE:

- Reunify or Rebuild?
(Reply to the FIT)
- Learn from the IC
(Reply to North)
- Alliance for a
Labor Party
- Poland
Nicaragua
South Africa

TRUTH, No. 211, August, 1986

Organ of the Trotskyist Organization of the USA,
Fraternal Section of the Fourth International,
For a Trotskyist Congress Rebuilding the U.S. Section of the Fourth International

P.O. Box 32546, Detroit, Michigan 48232

Editorial Board:

Kevin FitzPatrick, Margaret Guttshall, David Mark, Fred Michaels, Barbara Putna

Table of Contents

A Change in Policy.....	1
Draft Call for an Alliance for a Labor Party.....	3
The Labor Party and the Revolutionary Party.....	5
A Candidate for an Alliance for a Labor Party.....	9
No to Reunification with Anti-Trotskyists: Reply to FIT.....	10
Learn from the IC: Reply to David North.....	13
Volunteers for Nicaragua.....	18
Free Bujak, All Solidarnosc Prisoners.....	22
What Policy in South Africa?.....	24
Tokyo Summit.....	26

Subscriptions to TRUTH and FOURTH INTERNATIONAL:

Introductory (3 issues of Truth; 3 issues of FI) -- \$2; Regular (12 issues of each) -- \$10;
Supporting (12 issues of each) -- \$20.

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 Trotskyste) by Daniel Assouline

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 Trotskistas en la Revolucion Polaca by Alain Cavalier

For prices and further information write to us at the above address.

A Change in Our Policy

The Trotskyist Organization of the USA held its Ninth National Conference to draw a balance sheet of its struggle, assess the current situation, determine its tasks and prepare its participation in the Tenth World Congress of the Fourth International.

We decided that the current situation is characterized by the colonial peoples' tremendous upsurge against imperialism (South Africa, the Philippines, Haiti, Nicaragua), the workers' efforts in the imperialist countries to resume the offensive (the British miners' strike), and tremendous political ferment in the vanguard of the working class, including tendencies moving farther and farther away from Marxism, and others, arising in opposition to them, seeking to break with the opportunist leaderships, policies and methods that led their organizations into crisis.

The evolution of this entire situation in favor of the workers and their revolution will depend completely on the clarity of the vanguard. Thus, we decided to devote ourselves to an open, fundamental, theoretical, ideological and political struggle in the vanguard of the working class to clarify the most important questions of the revolution in opposition to centrism, to the Socialist Workers Party leadership and its policies; to prepare a Trotskyist Congress on this basis to rebuild the U.S. Section of the Fourth International, to regroup the best elements of the vanguard. We call on all militants, tendencies and organizations that want to resolve the crisis of leadership of the working class and the crisis of the Fourth International in the U.S. to join us in this struggle.

This decision represents a break with our past orientation which was a compromise between this orientation and a fundamentally different orientation for building the Fourth International in the U.S.: a line of building an independent party in opposition to the Socialist Workers Party that substituted formal independence from the SWP for real political independence, which can only be achieved

through submerging the Trotskyist Organization in a fundamental political struggle against the SWP. This compromise made it very difficult for the Trotskyist Organization to advance politically in preparing a Trotskyist Congress, to train its own cadres, and to reach others interested in resolving the crisis of the Fourth International in the U.S.

We decided to devote Truth and our contributions to Fourth International to preparing a Trotskyist Congress and the change in the title of Truth reflects this. We plan a series of articles responding to Barnes' attacks on Trotskyism, a series drawing a balance sheet of the crisis of the Fourth International and the struggle to rebuild it in the U.S., and open meetings to debate and discuss these questions. Finally, we decided to develop this political struggle in a fight for a united front, in particular, a fight for an Alliance for a Labor Party based on the union oppositions to concessions.

In order to facilitate this political struggle, the conference made a number of organizational and technical decisions. The most important of these is the decision to publish Truth and Fourth International on a monthly basis and to computerize their preparation and change their format in order to allow comrades more time for political work. We think that it is extremely important to publish both Truth and Fourth International. We need Fourth International so that we and others in America can base ourselves on the struggles and experiences of the Fourth International and the international working class as a whole. But we cannot do this and continue to typeset both. So we decided to sacrifice the form for the content. This, too, represents a break with our past policy, the benefits of which, if they are not already apparent, will be so soon.

We ask all our readers to support and participate in our struggle by writing for Truth and Fourth International, distributing them, discussing them, and by making a pledge to the International to

help finance this work. We not only welcome political contributions to Truth and Fourth International, we urge readers to make them. The preparation of a Trotskyist Congress rebuilding the U.S. Section of the Fourth International demands the largest possible political discussion and debate in the vanguard of the working class. We also need your financial support to organize this struggle. We need funds to help finance the World Congress, to further computerize the preparation of our propaganda, to organize delegations to distribute our propaganda in other cities, etc. We ask every reader and subscriber to Truth to pledge one-half day's pay to the International to help finance this work.

For a Trotskyist Congress to Rebuild the U.S. Section!

Pledge to the International!

Secretariat
Trotskyist Organization
July 1986

The Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International...

The Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International...

The Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International...

The Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International...

The Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International... the Trotskyist Organization... the Fourth International...

Draft Call for an Alliance for a Labor Party

We, union, working class, militants and tendencies, call on all militants and tendencies to join us in a common fight to form and build an Alliance for a Labor Party based on the growing union tendencies and locals against concessions.

The unionists and unions that have fought concessions -- PATCO, Greyhound, Phelps-Dodge, Wheeling-Pitt, P-8, and others -- represent the best elements of the American working class, the most far-sighted and self-sacrificing. They show the way forward for the working class. They represent the future of the working class as a whole.

Yet they have no political organization, no voice, with which to unite their energies, press their demands, and reach the masses of working people.

The bosses and union bureaucrats use the Republican and Democratic Parties, the union apparatus, their press conferences and publications, to isolate, vilify and hound the unionists and unions against concessions. Cops beat them with clubs. They say that the unions' struggle for higher wages and decent working and living conditions has priced the bosses' products out of the market and caused the layoffs, plant closings, economic crisis and degeneration of the society in general. They try to pit whites against blacks, Americans against Nicaraguans, Palestinians, Libyans, etc.

Workers hear these lies so often they start to believe them. The bosses and union bureaucrats have their parties and their publications. The workers must have theirs.

This is why we call on all union and working class militants and tendencies to join in a common fight to form and build an Alliance for a Labor Party based on the union tendencies and locals against concessions.

We propose the following platform of basic union and working class demands as the basis for this common fight. The purpose of this platform is to guide the Alliance on the most important political questions, not to provide it with a finished program. Each tendency within the Alliance can advance its own program and on the basis of, and in the course of, the common struggle against the bosses, the working class will be able to advance in resolving the political differences within it.

ALLIANCE FOR A LABOR PARTY!

1. INDEPENDENCE FROM THE BOSSES!

No to the bosses' parties and candidates, Republicans and Democrats
Labor candidates for office.

2. INDEPENDENCE FROM THE BOSSES POLICIES!

*No to concessions, layoffs, plant closings.
-- Restore all concessions; unlimited COLA.
-- Recall all laid-off workers; no forced overtime.
-- 30 hours work for 40 hours pay; divide work among all workers.
*No to the racist oppression of Blacks, Nicaragua, Libya, all oppressed peoples.
-- Open admissions to all unions, schools, trades, neighborhoods.
-- U.S. troops out of all foreign countries.
*No to government intervention in the unions.
-- Union democracy; no gangsters, no receivership.

3. A UNITED WORKERS FRONT FOR THESE DEMANDS!

No to the courts and cops.
Abolish Taft-Hartley, all anti-labor laws.

Vote for an Alliance for a Labor Party

All tendencies that claim to represent the working class have a responsibility to make a common fight against the bosses to build a Labor Party.

Join the fight for an Alliance for a Labor Party now!

Barbara Putnam, UAW Local 2071, Trotskyist Organization.

The American and British workers have the same interests and the same enemies. They are the workers of the world. They are the workers of the world. They are the workers of the world.

Yet they have no common fight. They have no common fight. They have no common fight.

The bosses of the world have the same interests and the same enemies. They are the workers of the world. They are the workers of the world. They are the workers of the world.

Workers have the same interests and the same enemies. They are the workers of the world. They are the workers of the world. They are the workers of the world.

It is the duty of all workers to join the fight for a common fight. It is the duty of all workers to join the fight for a common fight. It is the duty of all workers to join the fight for a common fight.

We propose the following program of work for the workers of the world. We propose the following program of work for the workers of the world. We propose the following program of work for the workers of the world.

ALLIANCE FOR A LABOR PARTY!

1. INDEPENDENCE FROM THE BOSSSES
No to the bosses parties and candidates. No to the bosses parties and candidates. No to the bosses parties and candidates.

2. INDEPENDENCE FROM THE BUREAU CRIMINALS

- No to congressional, judicial, and executive candidates.
- Recall all self-worshiping no forced overpaid.
- 40 hours work for 40 hours pay divide work among all workers.
- No to the racist oppression of Black, Mexican, Cuban, and other workers.
- Open education to all unions, schools, churches, and hospitals.
- No troops out of all foreign countries.
- No government intervention in the national.
- Union democracy; no trustees; no representatives.

3. A UNITED WORKING FRONT FOR THESE DEMANDS

No to the courts and cops. No to the courts and cops. No to the courts and cops.

The Labor Party and the Revolutionary Party: a Marxist Policy

By MARGARET GUTTSALL

One of the most important political questions that must be clarified in the vanguard of the American working class, in the preparation of a Trotskyist Congress rebuilding the U.S. Section of the Fourth International, is the centrality of the struggle for an independent party of the American working class, or a Labor Party, in the struggle to build a revolutionary party in America, and the nature of this struggle.

The current economic and political situation makes it especially important to clarify this question. The union oppositions to concessions are growing, the number of striking workers is increasing after decreasing for six years, and workers are striking who have never struck before (Frito - Lay, Seven - Up, Hygrade, Thorn Apple Valley) or who have not struck for years (Detroit city workers, Philadelphia city workers). Yet the limits and fragility of the capitalist economic recovery make it very difficult for the capitalists to grant concessions. The workers will have to turn again toward independent political action; they will have to confront the Democratic Party and the trade union bureaucracy, which are trying desperately to stop any form of independent political action (the withdrawal from the Coalition for Peace, Jobs and Justice, the suppression of Michigan Labor Against Apartheid, the attack on the National Rank and File Against Concessions).

The strength and direction of this movement depends entirely on the Marxists, on the vanguard of the American working class. If the Marxists assume leadership of this struggle, it will be possible to defeat the Democratic Party and the trade union bureaucracy in crisis and lead the movement in a revolutionary direction. If not, the movement will reach an impasse from the beginning or the leadership will fall to petty bourgeois forces and reach an eventual impasse as it did at certain points in Iran, Nicaragua or Poland.

Unfortunately, there is a tremendous

confusion in the vanguard of the American working class on precisely these questions. The Communist Party (CP) opposes the fight for independent political action, for a Labor Party and supports the Democratic Party. The Socialist Workers Party (SWP) opposes support to the Democratic Party, claims to be for a Labor Party, yet opposes an active struggle for a Labor Party today, particularly the fight for an Alliance for a Labor Party.

In the 1960s and 70s, in the anti-war movement, the SWP opposed militants and tendencies for a Labor Party; it said the American working class was not ready, that this would exclude workers who still supported the Democratic Party. More recently, in 1984 and 1985, in the presidential elections and the mayoral elections in Detroit, the SWP opposed the Trotskyist Organization's fight for an Alliance for a Labor Party and for a Workers Candidate; again it said the working class was not ready, that there was no mass movement upon which to base this struggle. And, in December 1985 and January 1986, at the National Rank and File Against Concessions Conference (Chicago) and the national rally in solidarity with P-9 (Austin, Minnesota), the SWP opposed the militants and tendencies fighting for a Labor Party (the Trotskyist Organization, the Workers League, the Revolutionary Workers League).

Yet this time it shifted ground. Instead of saying the workers were not ready, that there was no mass movement to base the struggle on, which is more and more obviously not the case, the SWP said this would disorient and divide the movement.

But the movement is already disoriented and divided, by the bourgeoisie, the Democratic Party, the union bureaucracy and their policy of imposing concessions and isolating and suppressing all opposition to this. A political struggle against the bourgeoisie, its agents and their policy of concessions, for an Alliance for a Labor Party to make this fight, is necessary to unite the movement and overcome these divisions.

The SWP even opposed inviting Crystal Lee Sutton ("Norma Rae") to speak at an anti-intervention and anti-apartheid rally in Detroit on the grounds that her anti-bureaucracy, pro-Labor Party struggle would upset Bernie Firestone, an Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union official loosely connected with the rally, and be divisive. Evidently, Socialist Action opposed inviting a P - 9 representative to speak at a similar rally in San Francisco for similar reasons.

This shows that the opposition to the fight for a Labor Party, to separate the working class from the bourgeoisie and its agents, represents a real problem for revolutionaries. This policy can only isolate revolutionaries from the most far-sighted and self-sacrificing elements of the working class, leave them under the influence of the bourgeoisie, and discredit Marxism in their eyes. Thus it is an obstacle to the construction of the revolutionary party. Attempting to construct a revolutionary party in America today, outside the fight for class independence, for a Labor Party, can only mean constructing a sect, completely outside the main line of development of the American working class.

This is not a Marxist policy.

For Marxists, the fight for the revolutionary program and party is not simply a good idea. It is an expression of historical necessity, of the fundamental contradiction in capitalism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and thus the necessary separation of the proletariat from the bourgeoisie and the inevitability of its fight for power. As Marx said, "...no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society or the struggle between them ... what I did that was new was to prove ... that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Letter to Weydemeyer, March 5, 1852; cited by Lenin, State and Revolution).

Thus Marxists have always been concerned with the actual movement of the working class toward independence, power, socialism,

and have always tried to base themselves upon it.

Marx wrote: "The Communists ... do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties.

"They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.

"They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement.

"The Communists are distinguished from other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality; 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

"... in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement" (Communist Manifesto).

In fact, the Communist Manifesto as a whole is a polemic against so-called socialists who do not base themselves on the real movement of the working class in opposition to the bourgeoisie, who are not scientific socialists, but utopian, petty bourgeois socialists.

Engels urged the early American Marxists to enter into the Knights of Labor, which he considered an expression of the American working class's elemental striving for class independence, and to fight for class independence, for Marxism, within this movement (Letter to Florence Kelly, December 28, 1886). Lenin, in one of his first discussions with an American Marxist, Louis Fraina, urged Fraina to take up a fight for a Labor Party in America. After Fraina expressed his opposition to this struggle, in his second discussion, Lenin told Fraina that he thought it was very important for Americans to study dialectics. In fact, an important part of the World Congress at that time was devoted to a political struggle with the

Americans and the British on the necessity to understand and enter into the real movement of the working class (July-August, 1920). (Theodore Draper, *The Roots of American Communist*, Chapter 15).

When Trotsky and the American Marxists, James Cannon and others, first discussed this question, they decided not to take up a fight for a Labor Party and they were correct. At that time there was no mass union movement, the capitalist crisis seemed to be proceeding relatively slowly, and they thought that the Communist League of America would be able to develop at a tempo in accord with events.

But when the rise of the CIO was confronted in 1937 with the second major crisis of American capitalism in less than a decade, closing off possibilities for gains through strikes, Trotsky argued that the American workers' struggle had to become political. He urged the SWP to champion the fight for a Labor Party based on the unions and to advance their fight for the revolutionary program and party within this movement, not all at once, but as it was dictated by development of the struggle itself.

Trotsky saw the Labor Party as a transitional formation, based on the real movement of the American working class in opposition to the bosses and their agents, that would give way to the construction of the revolutionary party through the actual development of the class and political struggle in which the Socialist Workers Party would be the leading and decisive factor. "...In its very essence the labor party can preserve progressive significance only during a comparatively short transitional period. The further sharpening of the revolutionary situation will inevitably break the shell of the labor party and permit the Socialist Workers Party to rally around the banner of the Fourth International the revolutionary vanguard of the American proletariat" (Trotsky, "The Problem of the Labor Party," *The Transitional Program for Socialist Revolution*, ed., George Breitman, p. 108).

This is why Trotsky thought it neither necessary nor desirable to demand

agreement with a number of transitional demands, or the transitional program as a whole, as a pre-condition for a common fight for a Labor Party. On the contrary, he urged the SWP to enter into a common fight with other working class tendencies, above all the Stalinists, to fight for a Labor Party and Labor Candidates against the bosses. He urged the Socialist Workers Party to support the Communist Party's presidential candidate in 1940 as a means to advance the struggle for class independence against the bosses. It was in the fight for a Labor Party that Trotsky urged the SWP to fight for the transitional program, not as a precondition for that fight.

Today, revolutionaries face a situation that is similar in some ways and different in others.

In the 1930s and 40s there was a mass union movement (the CIO) that came up against the limits of economic action in the midst of a capitalist crisis, there were strong tendencies in favor of independent political action and a Labor Party, although of a contradictory character (Labor's Non-Partisan League, Farmer Labor Party), and a revolutionary party (the SWP) to take advantage of the situation.

Today there is a growing mass union movement against concessions that is coming up against the limits of economic action in the midst of an extremely limited and fragile capitalist recovery, there are strong tendencies in favor of independent political action, again of a contradictory character (expressed in the movement against Mondale, the formation of the National Rank and File Against Concessions and other groupings), yet very few mass formations actually in favor of independent political action and a Labor Party. And those who claim to be revolutionary, Trotskyist, are divided and dispersed into several different organizations.

Does this mean that we cannot follow the same basic policy that the revolutionaries followed in the 30s and 40s? No.

Trotsky's policy in favor of a Labor Party

was always based on objective conditions, not on whether or not workers were for it, not on whether or not a movement or formations existed in favor of it. Thus, because the same basic objective conditions exist today, it is necessary to continue the fight for a Labor Party today, but in a different form.

A common fight for an Alliance for a Labor Party, based on the union tendencies and locals against concessions, in which each political tendency preserves its distinct character, is necessary. This is a way to give a political expression to the union movement, advance in establishing actual formations for independent political action and a Labor Party that are based on union tendencies, and begin to resolve the crisis of revolutionary leadership.

In order to achieve this, a political bloc is necessary, between all tendencies in favor of an active struggle for a Labor Party. This is the only way to overcome the combined opposition of the bourgeoisie, the Democratic Party, the union bureaucrats, and the CP and SWP leaderships, and eventually achieve an Alliance for a Labor Party that encompasses the vanguard of the working class as a whole and widen the arena for revolutionary, Trotskyist propaganda.

At the same time, precisely because of the crisis of revolutionary leadership, the division and dispersal of those who claim to be revolutionaries and the confusion in their ranks, this struggle for an Alliance for a Labor Party must be one step in the fundamental struggle to resolve this crisis.

The tremendous confusion in the vanguard of the American working class on the centrality of the fight for a Labor Party in the construction of the revolutionary party in America and the nature of this fight is not simply the result of objective conditions -- the post-war boom, the period of peaceful-coexistence between imperialism and Stalinism, the setback of the 1968 rise in the world revolution that began. It is also the result of the crisis of the Fourth International in the U.S. and the degeneration and ultimate departure of its U.S. Section, the Socialist Workers

Party. This has resulted in the proliferation of Stalinist and centrist positions throughout the vanguard of the working class.

The SWP's opposition to the real movement of the working class against the bourgeoisie, to the fight for a Labor Party, shows that it no longer represents the interests of the working class, of Trotskyism. It cannot be reformed. It cannot be reunified. And, above all, it cannot be ignored. A fundamental theoretical, ideological and political struggle in the vanguard of the working class against the SWP leadership and its policies, to prepare a Trotskyist Congress to rebuild the U.S. Section of the Fourth International, is necessary.

A theoretical, political and practical fight for an Alliance for a Labor Party is an important part of this fight. We welcome your contributions to all aspects of this struggle -- in the pages of Truth and in the practical struggle to form and build an Alliance for a Labor Party now!

A Candidate for an Alliance for a Labor Party

The Trotskyist Organization is fighting to put a candidate for an alliance for a Labor Party -- Barbara Putnam -- on the ballot in the 1986 Congressional elections in order to advance this struggle in the largest possible fashion. Barbara is a member of the Trotskyist Organization.

Barbara is a candidate for Congress from the 13th Congressional District in Detroit, Michigan. She is a veteran of the struggle for the independence of the working class against the bosses and union bureaucrats. She was a United Farm Workers organizer in California, a militant at the Chevy Gear and Axle Plant in Detroit, a participant in the Mack Avenue sit-down strike in 1973 and campaigned against union support to the bosses' candidates -- Ford, Carter, Reagan, Mondale -- in 1976, 1980 and 1984.

She was the Trotskyist Organization's candidate for Detroit mayor in 1985. She campaigned for an Alliance for a Workers Candidate for Detroit Mayor and a Labor Party, against the Socialist Workers Party's and the Workers League's refusal to join in a common fight for these goals. Barbara got 601 votes, the SWP candidate got 151 votes, and the WL candidate got 513 votes. This shows that an important section of working class militants in Detroit want a common fight against the bosses for their own candidates and their own party. A candidate in favor of this struggle, for an Alliance for a Labor Party should be on the ballot!

We ask all working class militants and tendencies, whether they politically support our campaign or not, to support our right to be on the ballot, by sending telegrams to the address below demanding that Barbara Putnam's name be placed on the ballot as an independent candidate for Congress from District 13 in Detroit and by sending financial contributions to help finance our legal action which may cost up to \$1500. Send statements and financial contributions to: Truth, P.O. Box 32546, Detroit, MI 48232.

No to Reunification with Anti-Trotskyists - A Reply to the FIT

By FRED MICHAELS

The Third National Conference of the Fourth Internationalist Tendency (FIT), a public faction of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), adopted a statement called "Prospects for Reunification of the Fourth Internationalist Movement in the United States." This statement makes it possible to clarify the place of the FIT in the current discussions and begin to uncover the roots of the SWP's rejection of Trotskyism.

The FIT wants to continue a discussion with the SWP and the other expelled oppositionists -- Socialist Action (SA) and Socialist Unity (SU) -- to "reunite the Fourth Internationalist movement."

For the FIT, the major obstacle to unity is quite clear -- it is the expulsion of the oppositionists from the SWP. Readmission of the expelled oppositionists to the SWP is the only way a "rapid reconsolidation of Fourth Internationalist forces" could take place.

What does this mean? It means that for the FIT, the prerequisite for the advance of Trotskyism is . . . unity with Barnes. And, while the SA has criticized the United Secretariat from a position of attempting to defend Trotskyism, it has not rejected reunification with Barnes either. The role of the FIT in advocating unity with Barnes as the key to "reuniting the Fourth Internationalist movement" above all else defines its role in this discussion.

The positive contribution of the oppositionists has been their defense of Trotskyism against Barnes' liquidationism. But the FIT is trying to protect Barnes and his policies from militants who are continuing the search for Trotskyism after their initial effort to clarify the Trotskyist character of the SWP resulted in being slandered, expelled and cut off by a gag order, from discussions with their previous comrades.

The Fourth Internationalist Caucus was formed by many of the older cadre of the SWP in order to keep the discussion within

the framework of the Barnes leadership. The eulogy for George Breitman in Socialist Action (June, 1986) mentions how much he fought "bitterly against all those who claimed that the seeds of the party's degeneration were to be found . . . in the SWP's program or practice prior to 1979."

This is the role that these older, cynical militants have played since the beginning of the discussion. They have wanted unity with Barnes at any price. They are hoping that Barnes will see the error of expelling such previously useful allies.

These older militants have played this role since they turned the party over to Barnes in the 1960's. Every time new militants took up a struggle against Barnes, it was these leaders who defended his policies. They have utilized the fact that they were leaders of the SWP before the reunification with the Pabloites in 1963, to stop new militants from finding Trotskyism elsewhere. They were key to the defeat of the Communist Tendency, the Proletarian Orientation Tendency, and the Internationalist Tendency.

The context for the FIT's analysis of the source of Barnes' anti-Trotskyism (and that put forward in Revolutionary Continuity by Diane Feeley and Paul LeBlanc, published by Socialist Action) must be understood.

Both organizations claim a continuity of Trotskyism from 1938 - 1979 through the Socialist Workers Party. Both claim that the Trotskyist program is the only program for the liberation of mankind.

Yet, after 51 years of struggle, they claim, Barnes' became "impatient." Barnes became "impatient" for the revolution; Barnes became "impatient" with the lack of growth (!) of the Fourth International; therefore he junks the historic program of the proletariat and adapts too much to Castro!

No, comrades.

The roots of the Barnes' rejection of Trotskyism can be found explicitly in the reunification with the liquidators of the

Fourth International and the simultaneous abandonment of the International Committee in 1963. But, Barnes and the other current leaders of the SWP joined the organization in the late 1950's and were trained in this period leading to the reunification. Thus, while we can say the roots of Barnes' attack are in the break from the International Committee, it is necessary to go even farther and to uncover the policies and decisions that led to the reunification.

It was during this training period that the ties of the SWP to the continuity of the Fourth International, the International Committee, became weaker and weaker. Thus, the Barnes leadership was never trained in a democratic centralist international, constructed for the purpose of resolving the crisis of the proletarian leadership brought on by Stalinism. It was terribly mistrained.

And the International Committee itself was weak. First, the defense of the Trotskyist program against Pablo was quite weak. There was no balance sheet of why Pabloism arose in the international, neither of the centrifugal forces on the international nor of the adaptations to Pabloism in its nascent stage. And, the struggle was abruptly terminated with the publication of the Open Letter before all the questions had been fully fought out.

And, flowing from this weak political struggle, the International Committee was organizationally weak. It never established an international, democratic centralist center. Instead, it functioned in a federalist manner.

Thus, militants trained throughout this period, without a conscious effort to overcome these weaknesses, would be saddled with them. Needless to say, with the reunification, these weaknesses became the entire program of the SWP, that is, the abandonment of the continuity in favor of adaptation to Stalinism.

It must be said that the SWP's unification with the Pabloites gave their liquidationist policy a new lease on life. Now it has reached its culmination in Barnes' attack on Trotskyism.

There is, as the intensity of the discussion among the oppositionists indicates, a search for solutions to the betrayal of Trotskyism by the Barnes leadership.

We think that this search must take place in a struggle for a Trotskyist Congress rebuilding the US Section of the Fourth International. A Trotskyist Congress open to all individuals, militants and organizations who want to rebuild the US Section.

We advocate rebuilding the US Section of the Fourth International for two reasons. First, there is a continuity. There has been a continuous fight for the Fourth International on the international level since 1938 -- through the initial period of the Fourth International (1938-1953), the International Committee (1953-1972), the International League/Rebuilder of the Fourth International (1972-1976), and today through the Fourth International rebuilt.

Second, the question of resolving the crisis of American Trotskyism, rebuilding the US Section, is the single most important question in front of the workers movement in this country. In fact, it has been for 25 years.

In order for the working class to engage in the struggle to build its own party, a political policy for that effort must be clarified. This policy is Trotskyism. It must be arrived at as a balance sheet of the struggle for Trotskyism internationally and in the United States. It must be based on the continuity and it must come alive today in a struggle against all the false programs that have paraded themselves as Trotskyist. The most important of these is that of the Barnes leadership of the SWP. This clarification is the basic reason for a Trotskyist Congress.

The Trotskyist Organization was founded in 1976 to carry out this clarification, that is, the political task of rebuilding the US Section. For 10 years we have waged a fight to implant Trotskyism in the working class, as part of the Fourth International, by the method of differentiating the Trotskyist program against all false

Learn from the IC: A Reply to North

By DAVID MARK

The crisis of the Workers Revolutionary Party (WRP) of England and the International Committee (IC) is raising once again all the questions of the principles, continuity, and balance sheet of the crisis of the Fourth International. The expulsion of Gerry Healy initiated a whole process of political and ideological ferment within the WRP. The Workers League (WL), the fraternal organization of Healy's international organization since 1962, initially allied itself with the WRP against Healy, then attacked the WRP after it publically condemned the campaign of slanders waged by the IC against the Socialist Workers Party entitled "Security and the Fourth International."

This defense of a campaign of cop slanders, not unlike those launched by the Stalinists themselves against the Fourth International and Trotsky, represents the maintenance of the most heinous and vulgar element of the degeneration of Healy's international organization. That the Workers League should choose the defense of this campaign as its basis for a break with the WRP undercuts its credibility severely. But even if the WL chooses to follow this course of Stalinist slander all the way to the end, it is important to clarify the balance sheet of this party, and the role that it has played in the American workers movement.

In his article, "Twenty-Seven Reasons Why the IC Should be Buried Forthwith and the FI Built," Michael Banda, a major leader in the WRP for decades before the split with Healy, concludes that the International Committee was a complete failure. The Bulletin, press of the WL, has replied to Banda's article with a series by David North, National Secretary of the WL. This series, which has gone on now for nineteen parts as a polemical response to Banda's article, tries to present the position of the Workers League in the crisis of Healy's international organization as an orthodox defender of Trotskyism. But North's response to Banda not only fails to examine the Workers League's own place in the crisis of the Fourth International, it

ignores the whole period after the Pabloite reunification Congress, during which the International Committee made its most important gains -- in the struggle to rebuild the Fourth International.

In the first place, North chooses to address the position of Banda as if no other tendencies existed within the WRP other than Banda's and North's -- a ridiculous and clumsy assertion if only because Banda himself is now completely isolated within the WRP, North's tendency represents a minority, and because many others within the leadership of the WRP, including Bill Hunter and others, publically opposed Banda's position. Even the United Secretariat has seen that there is a real debate within the WRP and, for its own reasons, has published the texts of these replies to Banda's article. Thus, in failing to even mention the real discussion that is going on in the WRP, North already shows us that the present course of the WL represents a withdrawal from the admittedly difficult, but nevertheless utterly necessary, effort of political clarification and reflection that has already been engaged by the WRP.

"There are those who attempt to justify their own backsliding by claiming that the betrayals of the WRP under the leadership of Healy necessitates a questioning of 'everything,'" writes North. Thus, North both assigns the responsibility for the entire crisis to the WRP, and tries at the same time to avoid having to question "anything" fundamental having to do with the origins of Healy's international organization and its relation to the crisis of the Fourth International.

But more importantly, there is a notable exclusion of history in North's article of the period when the WRP fought as a section of the International Committee to rebuild the Fourth International. And this is all the more glaring given the completeness with which North treats every aspect of the struggle leading up to 1953. Yet, it is precisely in this period that the Workers League was itself founded and acquired all of its major cadre.

In this regard, North's response shares something in common with Banda who devotes only two paragraphs to this historical juncture in the struggle of the IC:

"...the French now came forward with the revisionist theory that the revisionism of Pablo had destroyed the FI...and it was necessary to rebuild it, that the IC should have no disciplinary powers and must only be a guiding body.

"...Healy conceded to the scepticism, and the IC was renamed ICRFI (International Committee for the Reconstruction of the FI)..."

Banda then characterizes the Third Conference of the IC, which codified the perspective of rebuilding, as an "outrageous opportunist manoeuvre (sic)" because an invitation was extended to the Spartacist tendency and Lutte Ouvriere.

In reality it is Banda who, by tracing the history of the Fourth International since its foundation as a series of maneuvers, implies that the Fourth International was stillborn. But this is Banda's position now, it was not his in 1966, when he submitted the amendment below, precisely to clarify the perspectives of the 1966 International Conference against those who (Lutte Ouvriere, Spartacist) had pronounced the Fourth International dead.

"The Fourth International has successfully resisted and defeated the attempts of petty bourgeois opportunism, in the shape of a hardened revisionist tendency which penetrated all sections of the Trotskyist movement, to destroy it politically and organizationally. The struggle against this tendency was and remains the necessary preparation for the rebuilding of the International as a centralized proletarian leadership."

Thus, the struggle at the 1966 Conference of the IC was precisely to clarify against Lutte Ouvriere and Spartacist that the FI was not founded prematurely and was not destroyed by Pabloism. Nor did the 1966 Conference entertain the dangerous illusion that the struggle against the Pabloite revisionism was finished. On the

contrary, it took the position that the rebuilding of the FI as a world party had to proceed on the basis of a struggle against this revisionism to the end.

If North chooses to ignore this whole period it is precisely because the rump International Committee of Healy was born in a complete retreat from this process of rebuilding. For North then, the crisis of Healy's International Committee is seen in the framework and through the lens of a national retreat and isolation that encompassed not only the WRP but all of the components of Healy's rump IC.

"In the decade following the split with the SWP in 1963, the Socialist Labor League (predecessor of the WRP) marched from success to success," writes North, "...in the aftermath of the victory of the Labor Party in 1974, the WRP encountered new political problems stemming from the residual weight of reformism on the consciousness of the working class." North goes on to say that this reformist tendency represented by Alan Thornett was bureaucratically expelled by Healy resulting in the loss of "a large number of working class elements" and "the strengthening ... of middle class elements" in the WRP.

But even if this balance sheet contains elements of truth it is a balance sheet which competely ignores the Fourth International and the International Committee.

The essential world strategy of the Trotskyist movement of building the Fourth International as an international leadership to resolve the crisis of revolutionary leadership was abandoned in favor of a nationalist perspective which saw the construction of the International Committee as nothing more than a product of the material growth and successes of the Workers Revolutionary Party in Britain.

The establishment of the International Committee in 1953 did not conclude the struggle against the Pabloites. On the contrary, it represented a necessary stage in the struggle, that is, the preservation of the historical cadres as well as the program of the Fourth International

against a completely liquidationist course carried out by the international leadership under Pablo. It prevented only the worst consequences of Pabloism, the physical destruction of the Fourth International. Even if the role of the SWP was instrumental in 1953, it followed a whole period in which the SWP had allowed the Pabloite wound to fester.

The SWP never resolved this historical weakness and finally succumbed to it completely in 1963 with the reunification with the Pabloites. Finally, in its 1966 International Conference, the International Committee began an active process to rebuild the Fourth International, to recognize its federative character and move toward building an international leadership based on democratic centralism, and to realize a delimitation against the Pabloite revisionists in the rise of the class struggle which culminated in 1968. This advance in 1966, recorded by the Workers League in its pamphlet "Rebuilding the Fourth International," allowed the International Committee to make important conquests in the rise of the class struggle.

But the 1966 Conference and the struggle afterward never resolved the false orientation of Healy and the WRP that the existence of the Workers League, formed out of a factional struggle against the SWP, solved the problem of the Trotskyist Party in the United States. The Resolution of the American Commission of the Conference does not even mention the SWP, it proposes a perspective based on "...a concretization of the demand as elaborated by Trotsky for the formation of a Labor Party ... work in the anti-war and Vietnam movements ... the Trade Union and Negro movements," and proposes "...a public statement ... for winning over members of the Robertson tendency ..." It concludes, "A serious effort must be made to study dialectical materialism against pragmatism and idealism." That the omission of the SWP was not accidental would be shown particularly during the rise of the anti-war movement in the U.S., a movement which the SWP dominated for years but which the Workers League practically abstained from.

The split of Healy in 1972, using the

pretext of the Bolivian revolution, entrapped the Workers League as well in a national retreat. Despite its attempts to draw a balance sheet of the SWP's crisis, Healy's rupture with the process of rebuilding the Fourth International only reinforced the abstention of the WL from an active living struggle to develop this program in the class struggle.

The slanders themselves, that is, the campaign "Security and the Fourth International," represent a break with anything that could be interpreted as a Marxist, working class tradition. They also definitively blocked the Workers League from making any advance or contribution to the struggle against the Pabloite revisionism of the SWP. This Stalinist method was first employed by Healy against Wohlforth in 1974 when Wohlforth's companion, Nancy Fields, was accused of being a provocateur of the CIA. Precisely at the moment when it was possible to clarify the work of the Workers League, Healy substituted a campaign of vicious slander against Wohlforth.

The slanders then, originated not from any political assessment, principled reflection, or exigencies in regard to security, but rather in the complete political and moral bankruptcy of Healy in the face of the SWP and its revisionism. Thus it was that in the years after Wohlforth's expulsion, during which the slanderous campaign filled the pages of the Bulletin, the WL played absolutely no role at all in confronting the revisionism of the SWP, the liquidationist position of the Barnes leadership, nor in the political debate and discussion raised by the oppositions in the SWP. In fact, the reverse is true. If anything, the campaign entitled "Security and the Fourth International" sided the Barnes leadership by giving it a handy pretext for writing off the International Committee and its struggle against the SWP reunification.

This method has become for the Workers League a legitimate means of attacking ones political opponents. Thus North remarks at one point in his article that "Banda's assertions are so fantastic that one would not be surprised to learn that he wrote parts of his '27 Reasons' under

the influence of drugs."

Both for Healy and Lambert, abandoning the struggle against Pabloite revisionism, began by abandoning democratic centralism. Lambert would attempt a rapprochement with the Pabloites, while Healy would shut the rump IC up in a national retreat. Each would resort to the most heinous methods to stem the crisis, but only for a time. Inevitably the crisis had to break open.

But the IC's goal of rebuilding the FI did not end with Healy's and Lambert's retreat. The International League -- Rebuilder of the Fourth International, once again took up the battle in 1972, establishing at the beginning an international leadership based on democratic centralism and then, on the basis of the rise in the class struggle in 1974-75, with the Portuguese revolution and the upsurge in the whole of the Iberian Peninsula, making a delineation against centrism with the Fourth Open Conference Rebuilding the Fourth International.

It was in this period, in 1975, that the Trotskyist Organization joined the IL I, breaking with its existence as a national group. Our history, coming out of the Socialist Workers Party and the International Socialists, meant that we would have to cover again much of the groundwork of making a balance sheet of the Fourth International, its crisis, and of the role of the International Committee. This task had been begun by the WL in 1962 but by 1975 it was already being covered up.

The retreat of Healy therefore had an extremely negative impact on the Workers League and its development, as well as on the forces that were looking for an alternative to the opportunism of the SWP. On the one hand, it meant that the forces looking for Trotskyism, the Truth group among them, would be forced to develop on their own a balance sheet of the International Committee and that the fight to rebuild the Fourth International would come from forces in the American workers movement that had been outside the IC itself. And on the other, it meant that a campaign of vicious slander would isolate the WL, only helping the SWP to justify its capitulation in 1963. In this way, the

potential political and ideological capital of the 1962 minority in the SWP would be wasted in a vulgar campaign of Stalinist slander.

This does not mean that all Trotskyist traditions have been destroyed in the Workers League, but they are in great danger. It is not the political crisis, the upheaval in the organizations once comprising Healy's International Committee that the Workers League should fear. It is the maintenance of its past policy as if the split with Healy were only a VINDICATION of the national policy pursued by the WL in the US.

The crisis of the international organization established by Healy is at a juncture of historical proportions in which there can be a step forward in the construction of the Fourth International, supporting itself in the large reorganization that is taking place in the ranks of the vanguard internationally. If the WL chooses to block its place in this development by maintaining the slanders against the SWP it will only mean a retreat into an even deeper national isolation.

There is another course. It is difficult, but as the development of the debate within the WRP and the other components of the international organization established by Healy shows, it is possible in the present situation of a rise in the workers struggles and fermentation within the vanguard, to realize an advance in the construction of the Fourth International. It will necessitate for all, a critical re-examination of the deep crisis of the major parties that historically represented Trotskyism and a struggle based on principles and clarity breaking with the opportunism and bankruptcy of these centrist parties. In this line of struggle it is the rebuilding of the Fourth International and the continuity of its struggle that will represent the most tested component.

It is because of this line of struggle that the Trotskyist Organization, the origins of which were in a break from an existence as a national group and in taking up the fight to rebuild the Fourth International, can remind the Workers League of its

origins in this continuity and call on it to retract the campaign of slanders and all such methods in favor of a struggle to the end against the Pabloite revisionism, the liquidation of Trotskyism, that the Barnes leadership of the SWP represents. And this is our fight for a Trotskyist Congress to assemble all the healthy elements among the American vanguard to rebuild the American section of the Fourth International.

The Barnes leadership has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists. It has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists.

The Barnes leadership has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists. It has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists.

The Barnes leadership has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists. It has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists.

The Barnes leadership has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists. It has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists.

The Barnes leadership has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists. It has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists.

The Barnes leadership has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists. It has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists.

The Barnes leadership has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists. It has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists.

The Barnes leadership has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists. It has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists.

The Barnes leadership has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists. It has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists.

The Barnes leadership has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists. It has been a constant source of confusion and disunity among the American Trotskyists.

Volunteers for Nicaragua

By FRED MICHAELS

On July 18, Nicaraguan workers and peasants and their supporters celebrated the seventh anniversary of the overthrow of Somoza. The United States House of Representatives "celebrated" by passing a \$100 million aid package for the contras battling the revolution.

The House's move, which will be supported in some form by the Senate by the end of the summer and certainly made law by Reagan, escalates the war against Nicaragua to a new level.

This war, and its further escalation to the massive involvement of US troops, is a critical threat to the Nicaraguan Revolution. That is why the Fourth International and the Trotskyist Organization have fought to organize brigades of volunteers to fight alongside the Nicaraguans to defeat the contras, the Honduran military and the US "advisers." This is a contribution that the world workers movement must make to save the Nicaraguan Revolution.

The working class has to rely on its own forces to defend the Nicaraguan revolution. It cannot rely on the democratic bourgeoisie, the Kremlin or even the Sandinista leadership. The democratic bourgeoisie and the Kremlin want to strangle the revolution, which threatens their power, just as it threatens the imperialists' power. (This is why the Contadora group proposed to disarm Nicaragua; why Gorbachev met with Reagan to discuss "hot spots," said Nicaragua was in the US's "sphere of influence," and sends no more than a handful of helicopters to Nicaragua.) And the Sandinista leadership is incapable of leading a struggle against these forces, because it does not base itself on the international proletariat and the continuity of its struggle.

It is necessary to take a look at the relationship of class forces in Nicaragua and the role the Sandinista leadership plays to fully understand why the working class must rely on its own forces and take up a fight for internationalist volunteers

to defend Nicaragua.

The Sandinista leadership came to power on the basis of a revolution that destroyed the Somoza regime, thus it must defend at all costs against imperialism and counterrevolution. Nevertheless, the Sandinista leadership remains a radical petty bourgeois tendency that maintains a bourgeois state. And the war is exacerbating the contradiction between this tendency and the revolution.

The Sandinistas are attempting to create an independent, democratic bourgeois state in which the workers and peasants occupy a place similar to that in the democratic imperialist countries but with more rights and freedoms. But the Theory of the Permanent Revolution says that the revolution, once it has begun, must lead either to the working class dictatorship or to imperialist victory. There is no room for the kind of government the Sandinistas wish to create.

The fundamental weakness of the Sandinista government has been its inability to carry through two of the fundamental democratic tasks, that is, bourgeois tasks, posed by the overthrow of Somoza. These tasks are: the distribution of the land to those who work it and the establishment of national independence, that is, breaking the chains of imperialist domination.

These two tasks have not been completed. And in the face of the increased war threat, the Sandinistas are demonstrating graphically their inherent inability to do so. The revolution has stagnated under their leadership. Reagan's threats are even more ominous in this situation.

When the revolution first occurred, the Sandinistas confiscated the Somozaist lands and distributed them to the peasants. When asked what will the Sandinistas do if the peasants need land from other landowners, Jaime Wheelock replied, "then we'll take the rest of it."

But that has not happened. For example, only 17% of the land has gone to the poor

peasants and one-half of this was state land, ex-Somozaist land.

Early this year, the government revised the Agrarian Reform Law to allow more land distribution, i.e., it gave the government more discretionary power in its negotiations for land with the landowners. The debate and discussion around the law made it clear that it expressly forbids land seizures. It provides for complete compensation to landowners. It is clear: the land will not go to those who work it.

The Sandinistas created this law hoping to retard the mobilization of the peasants for land and at the same time to make the government appear willing to do something about agrarian reform. But it is not the peasants' land seizures that threaten the revolution.

The peasants need to seize the land of the rich landowners that support the contras. They feel this need every day. It is because of their continued bondage to the landowners (this is what the lack of agrarian reform means) that the peasants do not have the strength to defeat the contras. And, it is not surprising that the lack of land distribution has weakened the support for the revolution among the poorest peasants. One area has become something of a base for the recently expelled Bishop Vega, second in command of the Catholic Church in Nicaragua and an open supporter of the contras.

The Militant now reports that peasants are demonstrating for more land as if to say that the law responds to their needs. Yet it is clear that the peasants have been trying to seize the land against the wishes of the government.

For the policy that can actually resolve the agrarian question, it is necessary to hear Lenin speaking to a Peasant Congress after the February Revolution and before the October Revolution.

"Lenin said on April 28: 'We favor an immediate transfer of the land to the peasants, with the highest degree of organization possible. We are absolutely against anarchist seizures.' Why, then, are we unwilling to await the Constituent

Assembly? For this reason: 'The important thing for us is revolutionary initiative: the laws should be the result of it. If you wait until the law is written, and do not yourselves develop revolutionary energy, you will get neither law nor the land.'" (History of the Russian Revolution Volume 1, p. 400.)

The second incompleted task is independence from imperialism. The amount of money devoted to repayment of the debt (1.6 billion) was 85% of the total export earnings of the country in 1983. (Nicaraguan Ministry of Foreign Trade quoted in Contemporary Marxism No. 8, Spring 1984.)

Now, the total debt has risen to \$3.9 billion. The interest payment alone is now double the export earnings. (Jorge Buarque, Inprecor No. 185 quoted in Socialist Action, April 1986).

Now, it has been this debt (which the Sandinistas want to repay) that transmits the imperialist pressures for sacrifice onto the Nicaraguan masses as well as maintains the strength of the native capitalists in Nicaragua.

The inability of the Sandinistas to reject the national debt is linked to the support to the native capitalists. And it is here that the powerful Nicaraguan working class enters the picture. Because it is only the working class dictatorship that can carry through the democratic tasks, it is not surprising that the lack of progress has provoked a working class mobilization.

Not only have the peasants become tired of waiting for the land, but the workers have become tired of suffering the decreased standard of living while still being under the thumb of their capitalist oppressors in the factories, the agents of the imperialists. (Sixty-seven percent of the industry is privately controlled.)

The policy of the Sandinistas for the working class is quite clear. In speech after speech, they raise the need for more efficient production, increased productivity, work harder, etc., all for "the war effort." For example, in the Sandinistas trade union call for May Day

demonstrations they say, "We will keep on defeating the aggressors in the battle trenches and in the workplaces as well, with a double effort by everyone, with the discipline and self-sacrifice of combatants . . . we must make the necessary productive efforts. . ." (The Militant, April 18, 1986). Coupled with the ban on strikes, and the continued control of the majority of industry by the capitalists, this amounts to placing the sacrifice for the war completely on the shoulders of the oppressed and letting the capitalists off!

Workers have begun to strike again against the capitalists. Several have been reported. Yet the Sandinistas say that the striking workers hurt the revolution as much as the contras (both are striking blows against the Sandinistas "democratic state.") "Ortega also put on the same plane those who sabotage the economy and aid the contras the capitalists and those 'ultra-left groups which encourage strikes and labor indiscipline that affect production . . .'" (Socialist Action, April, 1986.)

In spite of this attitude, the Sandinistas have sought a unified May Day demonstration with the much smaller non-Sandinista unions (some of which are led by Maoists and others). These unions have led some of the strikes.

The desire for a unified May Day Committee meant that the Sandinistas even gave into demands for an organizational structure that provided for equal representation of each tendency in the committee. This can only be because the strikes and actions of these unions, whatever else their politics, have found an echo in the ranks of the FSLN and the Sandinista unions.

In another instance, the regime tolerated anti-union activity by a critical supplier to the military for 5 years. Now the workers have organized demonstrations and demanded confiscation of the business. Even with this patient response from the workers, the government has temporarily taken control of the company away from the capitalists and plans to return it to its owners as soon as possible.

For both the workers and the peasants, the

demands raised to the government have not only been concerned with land and wages, they have been concerned with the war. Among the women workers, their exclusion from the army provoked a campaign which underscores both the nature of the regime and the mobilization in Nicaragua.

The Militant reprinted an article from Barricada Internacional (international newspaper of the Sandinistas) in which the national army was criticized by the Sandinistas for refusing to draft women. Allowing women to volunteer for the army was the compromise that was achieved. We need ask only: who runs the army that revolutionary women had to fight to be allowed to volunteer? The army is not run by the workers or peasants but by bourgeois officers and the Sandinistas had to reach a compromise with them. Never mind the need for a draft itself.

This then is the significance of the Theory of the Permanent Revolution. It states that only a working class dictatorship is capable of completing the democratic tasks in countries oppressed by imperialism. And, in the course of doing so, the working class begins to resolve its own problems, that is, the socialist transformation of society. It is not possible to keep the peasants and workers in their place and develop a "normal" independent, democratic, bourgeois state in an oppressed country. It is precluded. Either the workers rule, or the imperialists.

All this provides a context for answering a simple question that is in the minds of the advanced workers of Nicaragua: Why doesn't the army throw itself against the contras and wipe them out once and for all? They number 15,000; the Sandinistas army is at least twice that. The government claimed that its rout of contra camps in March of this year was the "greatest blow against the contras in the last few years." Why doesn't it finish the job?

The answer is now clear: the Sandinistas do not wish to be isolated from the other capitalist countries of Latin and Central America or from some European nations like Sweden. So rather than risk their rejection, the Sandinistas alternatively

respond to the pressure of the masses at home by attacking the contras but not too much, a modicum of land reform, temporarily taking control of a vicious capitalist's factory. And they respond to the imperialists (under pressure by the Stalinists) by not driving out the contras, by not seizing the land, by not expropriating the capitalists.

The Fourth International bases itself on the mobilization of the workers and peasants to defend their revolution and is guided by the Theory of the Permanent Revolution. Therefore, we say: internationalist volunteers to defend Nicaragua.

...the masses at home... the pressure of the masses... the imperialists... the Stalinists... the contras... the land... the capitalists...

...the mobilization of the workers and peasants... the Theory of the Permanent Revolution... internationalist volunteers to defend Nicaragua...

...the mobilization of the workers and peasants... the Theory of the Permanent Revolution... internationalist volunteers to defend Nicaragua...

...the mobilization of the workers and peasants... the Theory of the Permanent Revolution... internationalist volunteers to defend Nicaragua...

...the mobilization of the workers and peasants... the Theory of the Permanent Revolution... internationalist volunteers to defend Nicaragua...

...the mobilization of the workers and peasants... the Theory of the Permanent Revolution... internationalist volunteers to defend Nicaragua...

...the mobilization of the workers and peasants... the Theory of the Permanent Revolution... internationalist volunteers to defend Nicaragua...

...the mobilization of the workers and peasants... the Theory of the Permanent Revolution... internationalist volunteers to defend Nicaragua...

...the mobilization of the workers and peasants... the Theory of the Permanent Revolution... internationalist volunteers to defend Nicaragua...

Free Bujak and all the Solidarnosc Prisoners!

By BARBARA PUTNAM

POLAND: A highly respected leader of the Solidarity underground movement, Zbigniew Bujak, who supported printing clandestine newspapers and history books and arranged distribution of finances to seven different opposition groups, was arrested May 31 along with three of his comrades. Another 30 Solidarity militants were arrested two weeks later. More show trials, such as those against Wladyslaw Frasyniuk, Bogdan Lis, Adam Michnik and others, are in the making.

Imprisonment of courageous leaders has inspired further resistance and demonstrations. But, it has also, in a fundamental way, set back the struggle. Now the task is to break the isolation of the Polish workers and the wall of silence. A well-coordinated plan of action, an international campaign to free the imprisoned leaders, as outlined in the Appeal published in this issue, will do that.

Jaruzelski hopes that through these arrests and trials to separate the leaders from the working class to prevent the inevitable explosion simmering in Poland. He said that Solidarity leaders are "anti-socialist gamblers, provokers and fanatics of counter-revolution" and "tools of foreigners who want to destabilize Poland". At the same time he characterized members of Solidarity as "millions of honest people who, most frequently involuntarily, let themselves be pulled into a dangerous game." (Speech to the Congress of the Polish United Workers Party in Detroit Free Press, July 14, 1986.)

Repression of leading working class militants who have been supported by at least 10 million workers, expresses in the sharpest way the counter-revolutionary, anti-working class character of the Polish bureaucracy and underlines the necessity to overthrow it. The futility of peaceful evolution and gradual reform (as proposed by Lech Walesa and others) and the impotence of the Walesa wing led to the formation of a bloc of four working class tendencies (Workers Press Alliance) who

agree on the necessity to overthrow the Jaruzelski regime.

Right at the moment when the working class vanguard is hammering out the means for advancing the cause of the Polish workers and overturning the Jaruzelski regime, Walesa, the man of moderation, says the aim of Solidarity should be "evolution, not revolution" (Detroit Free Press, July 13, 1986).

Repression, arrests and imprisonments of the vanguard threatens to keep the entire discussion and balance sheet that is being drawn in clandestinity from seeing the light of day. There will be no resolution of the problems facing the Polish Revolution, no resolution of the crisis of leadership, no fight for a revolutionary party outside an international struggle to free the political prisoners.

All organizations genuinely on the side of the Polish working class must coordinate their efforts to free Bujak and all political prisoners!

An Appeal to Release the Solidarnosc Prisoners
(reprinted from The Fourth International)

Today is May Day, the workers' holiday. The Independent and Self-Managed Union Solidarnosc ("Solidarity"), which has waged for more than four years a difficult and underground struggle against the military-police dictatorship of Jaruzelski, has always solidarized itself with the workers and peoples fighting for freedom on both sides of the "iron curtain" and in the so-called "third world" countries. And it still is doing this now too, when the workers and the Polish people are organizing, as every year, actions in the streets and in the plants, demanding, among other things: Freedom for Political Prisoners! Freedom for Solidarnosc!

Following the example of the diverse appeals in Poland and around the world, most recently the appeal in December 1985 by militants of different currents of the working class and democratic opposition of

Eastern Europe, we address ourselves once again to the working class, democratic, and youth movements in the West; to the unions, political organizations, associations and committees. This May Day, express your support likewise to the underground structures of Solidarnosc. Demand the immediate liberation of the union's leaders -- Wladyslaw Frasyniuk, Bogdan Lis, Bogdan Borusewicz, Tadeusz Jedynek, Adam Michnik -- and the hundreds of other political prisoners. Some of them, like Czeslaw Bielecki or Andrzej Gorski, for months have waged hunger strikes for the recognition of their status as political prisoners; others, like the leader of the Silesian miners, Tadeusz Jedynek, are threatened with long years in prison and even the death penalty.

Let this May Day of 1986 become the point of departure for a Permanent and International Campaign for the Liberation of All the Solidarnosc Prisoners. In a few months it will already be the sixth anniversary of the Polish August of 1980, which stirred to hope and sympathy among the workers of the world.

Take every initiative that you consider the most appropriate and effective. Coordinate them together, in the broadest possible way. Solidarnosc -- which gave the example of workers' unity above the goisms of groups and natural programmatic differences -- lives and fights. Don't believe what the propoganda tells you about a supported "normalization."

We also call on all the currents and militants of the working class and democratic opposition of the Eastern and Central European countries: join our appeal, regardless of the differences that separate us; coordinate together the multiple initiatives concerning the political prisoners.

April 1986

First Signers

Ludwik Juszkiewicz: former member of Solidarnosc in the Municipal Transit Authority (MKP) in Lodz
 Ryszard Pytlik: former member of the Solidarnosc regional leadership in Jastrzebie (Silesia)

Marian Sadlowski: former member of the national commission of Solidarnosc in the police force; working in Szczecin

Witold Slezak: former member of the national commission of the Solidarnosc printers' union

Stefan Bekier: militant of the Revolutionary Workers League of Poland (RLRP)

Ewa Szulc: militant of the Polish Socialist Party of Labor (PSPP); former militant of Solidarnosc in Szczecin

Konrad Szulc: militant of the PSPP; former militant of Solidarnosc in the shipyards of Szczecin

What Policy in South Africa?

By KEVIN FITZPATRICK

The growing strength and militancy of the mass anti-apartheid movement has driven the racist South African regime to impose a State of Emergency (on June 12) for the second time in a year. An estimated 8,000 militants have been detained, including, according to the latest figures from the Labor Monitoring Group, 321 trade union leaders and at least 2,700 rank-and-file union members. With the crushing majority of the remaining detainees being activists in the Black townships, it is clear that the Afrikaner government is well aware of where the threat to its rule lies.

At the same time, however, there has been an increase in military and terrorist attacks by guerrillas of the African National Congress (ANC). Thus, "ANC executive committee member James Stuart said: 'Quite clearly, there has been an escalation since the twelfth of June, and this is in line with ANC policy. Decisions have been taken to make this a reality.'" (Detroit Free Press; July 18, 1986.)

Already this year there have been 138 attacks, compared to 136 in all of 1985 and 44 in 1984. This has been at the cost of at least 35 fighters killed and 52 captured so far this year, including at least 17 killed since the State of Emergency began.

This policy of isolated military actions is not only opposed to the power of the mass movement, but in fact is connected to a political weakness of this mass movement. But let us be clear: we do not oppose the guerrillas' attacks on the basis of pacifism or "morality." The racist regime has no right to preach to anyone about violence or terrorism: it practices not only the generalized violence of military-police repression, but also clear-cut terrorist acts (the letter-bomb assassination of ANC and South African Communist Party leader Ruth First in 1982).

We are speaking as Marxists, who believe in the mass mobilization and organization of the oppressed and exploited around the working class for the seizure of power, for the smashing of the capitalist system that

produces apartheid. All of history teaches us that this clash will inevitably be violent. But the violence must be the organized violence of the masses, on the picket lines, in the demonstrations, in the building of militias and in the final overthrow of the regime. This is necessarily counterposed to the heroic actions of isolated militants engaged in single combat with the forces of the state.

In South Africa, this counterposition is clearer than ever. Every militant who has left his home and gone abroad for military training (8,000-10,000!), who risks or sacrifices his life in armed attacks within South Africa, would be ten, a hundred, times more valuable as a leader of the mass movement. Every conflict in the Black townships between the anti-apartheid militants who call themselves "comrades" and the stooges of the government calls out for organizers. The fact that the July 14 strike actions of COSATU (Council of South African Trade Unions, with 500,000 members) were not so effective as the massive general strike of June 16, marking the tenth anniversary of the Soweto rebellion, shows the need to reinforce the precariously thin layer of leadership. In the trade unions, in the mass movement, that is where every young militant belongs.

The same ANC that organizes these attacks is behind the United Democratic Front (UDF) and its attempts to limit the mass movement politically, to stop short of social revolution and to tie it to the perspective of a democratic and reformed capitalism spelled out in the ANC's "Freedom Charter."

The ANC itself is a petty bourgeois organization that for more than half a century sought to change the racist policies of first British and then Afrikaner rule by strictly legal or peaceful means. Its conception of armed struggle was the product and the continuation of this same reformist perspective. In the trial that resulted in his life sentence, Nelson Mandela himself expressed this.

"Our problem was not whether to fight, but was how to continue the fight. We of the ANC had always stood for a non-racial democracy, and we shrank from any action which might drive the races further apart than they already were. But the hard facts were that fifty years of non-violence had brought the African people nothing but more and more repressive legislation, and fewer and fewer rights. It may not be easy for this Court to understand, but it is a fact that for a long time the people had been talking of violence -- of the day when they would fight the white man and win back their country -- and we, the leaders of the ANC, had nevertheless always prevailed upon them to avoid violence and to pursue peaceful methods. When some of us discussed this in May and June of 1961, it could not be denied that our policy to achieve a non-racial State by non-violence had achieved nothing, and that our followers were beginning to lose confidence in this policy and were developing disturbing ideas of terrorism." (The Africa Reader: Independent Africa; ed., Cartey and Kilson; p. 324.)

The formation of the military organization Ukhonto we Sizwe ("Spear of the Nation") at this time was a development of the ANC's policy of limiting and controlling the masses; it was a way to let off steam. And it must be remembered that the first generation that went out to fight in this way was virtually exterminated, to the point that only the rise of the trade unions and of Steve Biko's "Black Consciousness" among youth led to the revival of mass struggle in the 1970's.

There is another critical aspect to this question. It is no secret that the South African Communist Party, which is completely loyal to the Kremlin, plays a major role in the ANC. We are not in the least concerned with fantasies of "Communist conspiracy," but with the reality of the policy of Stalinism -- to limit the revolution to a bourgeois-democratic "stage," to seek to appease imperialism by its "moderation." Fifty years after the start of the Spanish Civil War, we can say that the South African CP plays to the ANC the same role that the

Spanish CP played to the Republic -- the defender of the right wing, the sworn enemy of socialist revolution. So it is important to note that it is South African CP chairman Joe Slovo (Ruth First was his wife), who helped to write the "Freedom Charter," who is today a central leader of Ukhonto we Sizwe, whose policy it is to organize this separation of militants from the masses and their dispersion in military adventures.

Against this policy of the isolation of the vanguard, the Fourth International stands for a party of this vanguard to lead the oppressed to victory.

At the moment, the great power of the trade unions is limited by the fact that they have -- even with taking a clear stand against apartheid -- no overall political program. Against this lack of clarity, in which, lacking an alternative, the policy of the UDF tends to be accepted, the Fourth International fights for the formation of a distinct Workers Party, representing the interests of the oppressed Black workers, who are the key to the political solution. It likewise urges the AZACTU unions (led by the "Black Consciousness" AZAPO -- Azanian People's Organization -- which has a clearer and more anti-imperialist orientation) to unite their forces with COSATU and to work out a program in this fight for a Workers Party.

Against the manipulation and control of the masses, the Fourth International calls for the broadest, most open and democratic mobilization. No deals at the top! Instead, there must be a fight for a revolutionary Constituent Assembly, in which all the people of South Africa can decide the future of the country, while factory councils, assemblies, etc., of the workers and oppressed can organize themselves in this broad arena for their own power.

Around these two watchwords -- Workers Party, Constituent Assembly -- the Trotskyists fight to build the revolutionary party, the flower of the youth and workers, that can open the road to freedom in South Africa, and strike a blow felt all over Africa and around the world.

The Tokyo Summit

By BARBARA PUTNAM

To collect on the air strike against Libya, Reagan called a summit between the biggest imperialist democracies -- the US, Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, Canada and Italy -- in Tokyo, June 5. The intention was to bring deeper cooperation between these powers and the Kremlin against revolutionary struggles threatening imperialism across the globe, to put a pressure on Congress to vote for aid to the contras trying to overturn the revolution in Nicaragua, and to restore in the eyes of the world, the US as the principal keeper of "order," which some of the European nations questioned after Reagan bombed Libya.

What precipitated the Tokyo summit was continued revolutionary struggle in South Africa, the Middle East and Central America and especially events in Haiti and the Philippines, where US imperialism had to support getting rid of dictators to prevent their being overthrown by revolution. Under the watchword of "anti-terrorism," the Tokyo summit reunited the bourgeoisies against revolutionary struggles and put a pressure on the Soviet Union to "negotiate positively" for peace or, to put it bluntly, curtail in every way the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed.

Castro, agent of the Kremlin in this hemisphere, passively condemned Reagan's Libya air strike as "contempt... for international law and for peaceful coexistence between states." Castro, whom the centrist leaders of the United Secretariat and the Socialist Workers Party hail as a "great revolutionary leader," said that Reagan would not get support for bombing Libya from other imperialist powers. He said: "...the White House has found it impossible to obtain the support of its NATO allies..." "The response of the international community shows its rejection of Reagan's decision to disregard all civilized mechanisms, proclaiming himself judge and jury of international law..." (Intercontinental Press, May 19).

Proving the impotence of this "international community" and its so-called "rejection," Reagan completely dominated the Tokyo summit and has brought the nations who either opposed or were "neutral" over the bombing of Libya into line (i.e., France, Japan, West Germany, Italy) under threat of economic bludgeoning. Neither NATO nor any other organization answerable to world imperialism can stop Reagan's headlong charge towards war. Reagan thumbs his nose at international law and the World Court -- except when a decision helps the United States. For instance, while the US government accepted the legal jurisdiction of the World Court when it came to the case against Iran over the seizure of American hostages in 1979, now it rejects the decision to outlaw American financial backing of the contras in Nicaragua.

Because the Kremlin seeks to make a deal with Reagan in yet another Geneva summit, it took a "hands off" attitude to the bombing. They advised "diplomatic wisdom," that is, to do nothing drastic. In fact, the Kremlin knew beforehand the air strike would take place and removed its ships from Libyan waters two days ahead of the attack. Even though the Soviet Union has sophisticated missiles inside Libya, it did not use them to retaliate, and since then has refused to provide equipment to Libya that would aid in stopping further attacks by the US.

Although there were large demonstrations against the bombing of Libya in Europe, the response in the US itself was quite feeble, with only a handful of small demonstrations. This makes sense since in the US a good many of the left wing radical and working class parties believe that the way to disarm Reagan is through pacifist pressure tactics, turning an eye toward Geneva and hoping for a peaceful resolution of all conflict. The conclusion they may draw is, "if we abstain from drastic measures, pursue a course of least resistance, then we will avert World War III and the annihilation of mankind." This is completely consistent with the passivity of

the Kremlin in face of Libya.

While Reagan may appear to be in a stronger position than ever, it must be kept in mind that imperialism always appears most formidable when it is most threatened. The alliance formed in Tokyo is already on shaky ground because it is not an alliance of equals but one of predominance of the US over its "allies." This new found agreement and the pressure to retreat on the part of the Kremlin will only be a prelude to new class confrontations and social explosions within these countries, exacerbating the contradictory interests of the different bourgeoisies.

We correctly identify the role of the Kremlin as well as Castro as counterrevolutionary. We believe the way to disarm Reagan is not through the mechanism of the Geneva summit, the Salt talks, nor the World Court, but through rebuilding the US Section of the Fourth International and leading the working class to disarm US imperialism alongside its brothers ansisters everywhere.

